

By

Moulana Abu Muhammad ibn Dawood Qadhi

karbala

A Bloody Conspiracy And The Secrets Behind it



AhleSunnah library

Karbala

A ‘Bloody’ Conspiracy and the Secrets behind it

(Ml) Abu Muhammad ibn Dawood Qâdhi

Contents

Part 2
Contents

بسم الله الرحمن الرحيم

نحمده و نصلي و نسلم على رسوله الكريم

Preface

The issue of Karbala and the role that Yazîd had played therein has always been a contentious issue amongst the Ulema and the general masses. Much that has been narrated regarding the events before and after the incident have been based upon historical narrations. These can never serve the purpose of being used as a proof, owing not only to the weakness of the majority of its narrations, but also due to the existence of conflicting narrations as well.

Writing on this subject has never been deemed easy, since one must ensure that one maintains utmost respect for the *Ahle-Bait* (immediate family of Rasulullâh'), while at the same time conforming to the demands of justice that has been required before pronouncing the 'guilty verdict' upon any party.

Much courage to take a step in this most dangerous direction was attained through two articles written on this subject, by two great luminaries, viz. the great Muhaddith of India, Hadhrat Moulâna Habibur-Rahmaan Sâhib Al-Azmi رحمة الله عليه and the great philosopher, Hadhrat Moulâna Manzoor Nu'mani Sâhib رحمة الله عليه, in which both personalities retracted from previously-held notions regarding the character of Yazîd.

The gist of the article written by Hadhrat Moulâna Habibur-Rahmaan Azmi Sâhib رحمة الله عليه, in which this great scholar made known his retraction

from a previous article he had written thirty years previously, is as follows[1]:

With regards to Yazîd, a wonderful book has been written, titled ' اغاليط المؤرخين -The Errors of the historians', which I feel should be translated into Urdu and published again and again.

Under the chapter of 'Yazîd ibn Muawiyah' the author of this book[2] has written:

> *In تاريخ الخلفاء of Allamah Suyuti (R.A) much criticism has been labeled against Yazîd and he has even been cursed. It is my opinion that the writings against Yazîd are not Suyuti's, but rather it has been falsely attributed to him and entered into his writings. If this is not the case, then it will have to be said that Suyuti had, without making any deep research, merely quoted these statements from other historians.*
>
> *The lengthy stories that historians have quoted depicting the oppression Yazîd meted out to the Ahle-Bait are mere stories, narrations with no sound sanad (chain of narrators). The truth of the matter is that the Muslim Ummah had accepted Yazîd as caliph. Allegiance to him had been taken based upon Shar'ee (Islâmic juristic) principles. After becoming caliph Yazîd had to naturally turn his attention towards those issues which could*

[1] Hadhrat Moulâna had written this article in reply to a question received from the Mufti of Dârul-Ulûm Deobanb, Hadhrat Mufti Habîbur-Rahmân Sahib رحمة الله عليه regarding the issue of Karbalâ.

[2] The author was the Mufti of Damascus, Sheikh Muhammad Abul-Yusr ibn Aabideen, the grand-nephew of Allamah Ibn Aabideen Shaami (R.A)

cause disunity in the Ummah, one of which was the standing up of another person or partyرضي الله عنه against the caliph.

Those that were unhappy with the appointment of Yazîd, their unhappiness was based on the fact that they felt themselves or some else more deserving of the position, which without doubt was correct since they were indeed more pious than Yazîd. The standing up of this group however occurred after the pledge of allegiance had been taken by the majority, thus just as Hadhrat Aliرضي الله عنه had fought against those who had stood up against him, so too was the case with Yazîd. In fighting against the opposition however, Yazîd never issued any command that the Ahle-Bait be dishonored or oppressed.

Damiri (Shafee') has quoted in Hayaatul-Hayawaan that when the blessed head of Hadhrat Huseinرضي الله عنه was brought in front of Yazîd and when he heard the details of what had occurred at Karbala, he burst out crying and stated that there was no real need to have Hadhrat Huseinرضي الله عنه killed and that had he, Yazîd, been present at the battle, he would have surely pardoned Hadhrat Huseinرضي الله عنه. At that juncture Yazîd even cursed Ubeidullah ibn Ziyaad for what he had allowed to happen.

The author thereafter, after quoting various narrations from the Tarikh of Ibn Jareer which show the good conduct that Yazîd displayed with the Ahle-Bait, explained that the virtues mentioned by Rasulullâhﷺ for the first army that shall set out on sea for Jihaad and the first army that shall lay an attack on the city of Constantinople should surely also apply for Yazîd since he was part of these two armies. Rasulullâhﷺ had promised Jannah and forgiveness for the participants of these two armies.

I (Ml Habeebur-Rahmaan Sâhib) say, ‘Whoever states that Yazîd was nothing but the son of an Ameer sitting on his father’s throne, why does he rather not say that Yazîd was the son of a great Sahabiؓ, the son of a great juristؓ and the son of the trusted scribe of Rasulullâhﷺ. His statement drips with disrespect for Hadhrat Muawiyaؓ! Had this person perused through the writings of Hafiz Ibn Hajar in Al-Isabah he would have perhaps never have uttered such nonsense. Hafiz Ibn Hajar has narrated that when Hadhrat Abu Ayoob Ansaariؓ fell sick during the battle of Constantinople, Yazîd came to enquire regarding his health. Hadhrat Abu Ayoobؓ requested that if he were to pass away he should be placed on the back of a horse and taken towards the city as far as possible. When advancing further is no longer possible, he should be buried at that very spot. This bequest of Hadhrat Abu Ayoobؓ was fulfilled by Yazîd. Will one occupied with the enjoyments and comforts of the chair of the king bother fulfilling such requests?

Do those taunting Yazîd not know that in the path of Jihaad even the one sitting on the chair does not get deprived of reward? Continuing further, the author of the book has written that Sheikh Sinânudeen Amaasi has quoted in Tabyînul-Mahârim (an accepted and well-recognized book of the Hanafi Mazhab) a letter sent by Yazîd to the people of Basrah, in which Yazîd had quoted a hadith of Rasulullâhﷺ with regards to the warnings given for being treacherous in the affairs of booty. Would one drowned in evil and haraam ever bother sending out such edicts and would ever a jurist utilize a narration and an order issued by a perpetrator of haraam to establish a fiqhi law?

The author in his writings has also shown the errors of Munaawi and Taftaazani in their criticism of Yazîd. Quoting from Rûhul-Bayaan, the author has presented the fatwa of Hafiz Ibn Salaah that the demand of the principles of the Shariah and sound historical narrations is that one

does not curse Yazîd, nor should he go to the other extreme of taking Yazîd as his bosom friend, but rather should treat and view Yazîd in exactly the same manner as he views the other Islâmic rulers that came thereafter. In the Fatâwa of Shihâb Ramli it is mentioned that cursing Yazîd is not permissible. This has been clearly mentioned by a group of recognized scholars, with the author of Khulasah being amongst them.

The author has written that the Mazhab of the Ahl-e-Sunnah regarding Yazîd is that which has been mentioned in 'Bad'ul'Amaali', which is:

و لم يلعن يزيدا بعد موت سوى المكثار في الاغراء غال

(After the death of Yazîd only he shall curse him who is an extremist, and who is desirous of nothing but stirring trouble)

The author has also made reference to the refutation of Mullâ Ali Qari رحمة الله عليه against the criticism of Taftâzâni leveled against Yazîd. The student of Ibnul-Hummâm, Kamâl ibn Abi Sharîf, has also refuted Taftâzâni's writings, ending on this note that Taftâzâni's criticism of Yazîd does not befit with the demands of justice.

On a concluding note the author has mentioned that there are four Ahâdith recorded in the Sihâh which lend great indication that Yazîd was indeed far from what general history has depicted of him.

Amongst them is the Hadith of Sahih Bukhâri, in which mention is made that Hadhrat Abdullâh ibn Umar رضي الله عنه gathered his sons and servants and warned them that Rasulullâh صلى الله عليه وسلم had warned the Ummah against treachery. Ibn Umar رضي الله عنه then stated that since they had pledged allegiance to Yazîd, on the name of Almighty Allâh and His Messenger', it was not at all permissible for them to now break that allegiance. Ibn Umar رضي الله عنه threatened that if any of them breaks their allegiance he, Ibn Umar رضي الله عنه, shall cut off ties completely with that individual.

This is the crux of what has been written in 'اغاليط المؤرخين -The Errors of the historians' from page 117 to 132, and this is more than sufficient for anyone with a slight amount of Deen and piety.

(Moulâna) Habibur-Rahmaan Al-Azmi رحمۃ اللہ علیہ
Penned down by Rashied Ahmed Al-Azmi
3 Rabiul-Awwal 1399

(Article published in مجلہ المآثر مؤ)

As for the article written by Hadhrat Moulâna Manzoor Nu'mani Sâhib, that can be found as a preface to the book written on the subject of Karbala by his honorable son, Moulâna Ateequr Rahmaan Sanbali, titled 'واقعہ کربلا اور اس کا پس منظر' *(The Incident of Karbala and its background)*.

Taking courage and aid from what these luminaries had written, the following treatise was thereafter prepared.

Introduction to the topic

The death of Hadhrat Husein رضي الله عنه, which is commonly known as 'Karbala', was indeed one of the most tragic events in the history of Islâm, but not for the reasons which have generally been understood. If the grief over Hadhrat Husein رضي الله عنه's martyrdom was merely on account of his رضي الله عنه being martyred, then a question should surely arise as to why has this grief only been displayed over his رضي الله عنه death? Was the death of Rasulullâh ﷺ not a more tragic event? And if it is said that the extra grief is due to the cruel manner in which Hadhrat Husein رضي الله عنه was killed, then one could surely ask as to why such grief is then not displayed over the death of Hadhrat Uthmaan رضي الله عنه.

In the pages that follow, an attempt has been made to delve deep into the episode of 'Karbala', in search of the many unanswered questions that revolve around this issue, and in search of the true villains responsible not just for the death of Hadhrat Husein رضي الله عنه, but for the widespread chaos, bloodshed and anarchy that resulted therefrom.

By merely glancing at the battle itself and perhaps a few days prior to the battle, one gets exposed to only that portion of 'Karbala', which the hypocrites of Islâm have always attempted to bring forward, due to the support they acquire through it in achieving their sinister motives. However, when this matter is studied carefully bearing, keeping in mind the seventy years of Islâmic history that had preceded it; the era during which it occurred; the area in which it occurred; the people with whom it had occurred; the reasons behind Hadhrat Muâwiyah رضي الله عنه appointing Yazîd as his vicegerent; and the reasons which brought Hadhrat Husein رضي الله عنه over to Irâq, when 'Karbala' gets discussed, keeping all these issues in mind, a new picture emerges, totally different from what had previously been entrenched in the minds of people.

Thus, in the first half of this book, various such issues shall be discussed, which, when pieced together in one puzzle, shall enable one to reopen an investigation into a fifty-year old conspiracy, which finally culminated with the catastrophe, known as ‘Karbala’. Amongst these issues are:

1) Looking at Irâq/Iran and its inhabitants in the light of the Ahâdith
2) The propaganda of the hypocrites of Irâq against every leader in Islâm
3) The strength and status of historical narrations
4) The era of Hadhrat Muâwiyahرضي الله عنه
5) Who assassinated Hadhrat Hasanرضي الله عنه and why
6) Reasons behind Hadhrat Muâwiyahرضي الله عنه remaining insistent regarding the appointing of Yazîd as caliph

After the death of Hadhrat Muâwiyahرضي الله عنه, Hadhrat Huseinرضي الله عنهset out for Irâq, with the hope of taking back the Caliphate from the Ummayyad family. Hadhrat Huseinرضي الله عنه chose Irâq as the base from where heرضي الله عنه could launch his military campaign due to the numerous invitations, and hundreds of letters heرضي الله عنه had received from various parties in Irâq. Yet, upon his arrival, these parties disappeared from the scene, leaving Hadhrat Huseinرضي الله عنه to the mercy of Ubeidullah ibn Ziyaad and his forces. Why did all these parties disappear? Did they merely turn coward upon receiving news of the arrival of Ubeidullah ibn Ziyaad or was the reason behind their disappearing act based upon some other ulterior motive?

Could it be that the parties that had invited Hadhrat Huseinرضي الله عنه over to Irâq were in fact hypocrites and shaitâni forces, plotting to reignite the flames of infighting within the Ummah, and to turn the masses against their leaders, thereby ensuring that the Caliphate never remain stable? When one makes an in-depth study of the people of Irâq/Iran in the light of the Ahâdith of Rasulullâhﷺ, and in the light of their history, prior to Islâm reaching their lands, this seemingly improbable notion becomes more and more probable.

The first part of this book shall thus deal with this subject:

Irâq/Iran in the light of the narrations

Hadhrat Abu Hureirahﷺ has narrated that Rasulullâhﷺ said:

رأس الكفر قبل المشرق[3]

'The centre of kufr is towards the East'

Hadhrat Abdullûh ibn Umar ﷺ mentioned, 'I saw Rasulullâhﷺ pointing towards the East and saying,

'Trials shall come from there! Trials shall come from there!'[4]

In an attempt to pinpoint the exact area intended in this narration, scholars have provided a few possibilities, but the one that has attracted the attention of the majority is **Irâq/Iran**, which includes Kufa, Basrah, Baghdad, Khuraasan, etc. This area was the capital of the Persian Empire, and was famous as the stronghold of the *majûs* (zoroastrians). It was from this area that the majority of the early conspiracies against Islâm were planned.

The Ahâdith and statements of the Sahâbahﷺ and Tâbi'een which indicate that 'East' refers to the area of Irâq/Irân are many. From amongst them are the following:

- Hadhrat Abdullâh ibn Umarﷺ has narrated that he witnessed Rasulullâhﷺ **pointing towards Irâq**, saying,
'*Listen well! Fitnah (trials and tribulations for the Ummah) shall*

[3] رواه مسلم

[4] عن ابن عمر رأيت رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم يشير نحو المشرق إن الفتنة ههنا إن الفتنة ههنا

(صحيح ابن حبان)

come from there! (Rasulullâhﷺ repeated this thrice.) *It is there that the horn of shaitân shall rise!'*[5]

- Abdullâh ibn Umar narrates that Rasulullâhﷺ once made dua for the land of Shâm and Yemen. When the Sahâbah asked for dua for Najd (a famous raised area of Irâq[6]), Rasulullâhﷺ replied,
  'That is the area of tremors and trials, and it is there that the horn of shaitân rises/shall rise!'[7]

In explaining the meaning of the rising of '*qarn-u-shaitân*' (the horn of shaitân), scholars have mentioned various possibilities, viz.

- shaitân really has horns, and it is in this land that he rises / shall rise to make his attacks.
- It is metaphoric; referring to power, i.e. from this land shaitân's power shall spread.
- It refers to the army/helpers of shaitân, i.e. this area shall be their capital/headquarters.
- The word '*Qarn*' refers not to 'horns', but rather to 'generation'. The meaning of the narration shall then be: ***'In this land, evil shall continue springing up. Every time one generation comes to an end, another shall rise.'***

- Speaking of the Harûriyah (i.e. the Khawârij), Hadhrat Sahl ibn Huneif explained that he had heard Rasulullâhﷺ saying,
  'From there, (<u>pointing towards Irâq</u>), that group shall emerge

---

[5] عن ابن عمر قال : رأيت رسول الله صلى الله عليه و سلم يشير بيده يؤم العراق ها ان الفتنة ههنا ها ان الفتنة ههنا ثلاث مرات من حيث يطلع قرن الشيطان (مسند احمد بسند صحيح)

[6] قال الخطابي نجد من جهة المشرق ومن كان بالمدينة كان نجده بادية العراق ونواحيها وهي مشرق أهل المدينة (فتح الباري) وكل ما ارتفع عن تهامة إلى أرض العراق فهو نجد (عمدة القاري) قال الباهليُّ : كُلُّ ما وَرَاءَ الخَنْدَقِ عَلى سَوادِ العِرَاقِ فَهو نَجْدٌ (تاج العروس)

[7] عن ابن عمر قال قال رسول الله' : (اللهم بارك لنا في شامنا وفي يمننا) . قال قالوا وفي نجدنا ؟ قال قال (اللهم بارك لنا في شامنا وفي يمننا) . قال قالوا وفي نجدنا . ؟ قال قال (هناك الزلازل والفتن وبها يطلع قرن الشيطان (صحيح البخاري)

who shall recite Qurân, but it shall not pass their throats (i.e. it shall not affect their hearts at all). They shall be exiting Islâm as an arrow leaves its bow.'[8]

It was from this very area (i.e. Irâq and its neighbouring areas) that:

a) the killer and the parties responsible for the assassination of Hadhrat Umar ﷺ came[9]
b) the killers of Hadhrat Uthmân ﷺ[10] came
c) the battle of Jamal occurred in this area, i.e. near Basrah[11], which was perhaps one of the greatest trials for the Ummah.
d) the rise of the Khawârij occurred in this area. Many of the soldiers of the army of Hadhrat Ali ﷺ who participated in the battle of Siffîn (between Hadhrat Ali ﷺ and Hadhrat Muâwiyah ﷺ) were from Kûfa (Irâq). After the battle, when a truce was finally reached, these soldiers showed their true colours by abandoning Hadhrat Ali ﷺ, and settling in the area of Harûrah (a district of Kûfa). Their abandoning Hadhrat Ali ﷺ

---

[8] عن سهل بن حنيف سمعت رسول الله صلى الله عليه و سلم يذكر قوما يخرجون من ههنا وأشار بيده نحو العراق يقرؤون القرآن لا يجاوز حناجرهم يمرقون من الدين كما يمرق السهم من الرمية (مسند احمد بسند صحيح)

[9] In the assassination of Hadhrat Umar, the names of four people came up, viz. Abu Lu'lu Firoz Al-Majûsi (the killer), Hûrmuzaan, Jufeina, and the son of Firooz. (Usdûl Ghâba)

The following text appears in Târikhul Islam of Hâfiz Zahabi :

عبد الرزاق، عن معمر، عن الزهري: أخبرني سعيد بن المسيب، أن عبد الرحمن بن أبي بكر ولم تجرب عليه كذبة قط قال: انتهيت إلى الهرمزان وجفنية وأبي لؤلؤة وهم نجي فتبعتهم، وسقط بينهم خنجر له رأسان نصابه في وسطه، فقال عبد الرحمن: فانظروا بم قتل عمر، فنظروا فوجدوه خنجراً على تلك الصفة

Abu Lu'lu and his son were both fire worshippers. Hûrmuzân, a famous leader of the Persians, accepted Islâm after being caught. Some have said that he was a good Muslim. Others felt he definitely played some part in the assassination of Hadhrat Umar ﷺ, since Hadhrat Abu Bakr ﷺ's son had seen him holding the knife the night before the killing. (And Almighty Allâh knows best)

[10] وعن أبي جعفر القاري قال: كان المصريون الذين حصروا عثمان ستمائة: رأسهم كنانة بن بشر، وان عديس البلوي، وعمرو بن الحمق، والذين قدموا من الكوفة مائتين، رأسهم الأشتر النخعي، والذين قدموا من البصرة مائة، رأسهم حكيم ببن جبلة، وكانوا يداً واحدة في الشر (تاريخ الاسلام للذهبي)

[11] وكانت الوقعة يوم الجمعة، خارج البصرة، عند قصر عبيد الله بن زياد (تاريخ الاسلام للذهبي)

at this stage clearly showed that their purpose behind the war was never to establish justice, but rather to keep the Ummah fighting amongst each other. This group became famous as the Khawârij, regarding whom Rasulullâhﷺ had many years previously warned the Ummah about, saying[12]:

'From the East there shall emerge a sect, whose Jihâd, Salâh, and fasting shall amaze all, but in reality they shall be exiting from Islâm as an arrow exits from the bow, (i.e. with great speed). Amongst them shall be a man whose forearm shall bulge out as the breast of a woman. The group at that time, which is closest to the truth, shall stand up against them!'

Hadhrat Ali, after witnessing the emergence and rise of this sect, which in a short span of time had reached numbers of up to twelve thousand, waged a severe war against them, and with the Divine Aid of Almighty Allâh, destroyed their backbone. At the end of the battle Hadhrat Ali even sent his soldiers in search of the one who had been described by Rasulullâhﷺ. After an extensive search he was located hidden under some dead corpses. He was dragged in front of Hadhrat Ali, affording all the oppertunity to see the truth of the words of Rasulullâhﷺ.

e) the martyrdom of Hadhrat Ali occurred in Kûfa, and those behind the assassination were all from the Khawârij sect[13], whose roots were in Irâq.

---

[12] إن طائفة تخرج من قبل المشرق عند اختلاف من الناس ، لا ترون جهادكم مع جهادهم شيئا ، ولا صلاتكم مع صلاتهم شيئا ، ولا صيامكم مع صيامهم شيئا ، يمرقون من الدين كما يمرق السهم من الرمية ، علامتهم رجل عضده كثدي المرأة ، يقتلهم أقرب الطائفتين من الحق فسار علي إليهم ، فاقتتلوا قتالا شديدا ... و فيها "فقال : ابتغوه ، فطلبوه ، فلم يجدوه ، فركب علي دابته وانتهى إلى وهدة من الأرض ، فإذا قتلى بعضهم على بعض ، فاستخرج من تحتهم ، فجر برجله يراه الناس"(رواه إسحاق بن راهويه بسند صحيح – اتحاف الخيرة)

[13] انتدب ثلاثة نفر من الخوارج : عبد الرحمن بن ملجم المرادي وهو من حمير وعداده في بني مراد وهو حليف بني جبلة من كندة . والبرك بن عبد الله التميمي وعمرو بن بكر التميمي . فاجتمعوا بمكة . وتعاهدوا وتعاقدوا ليقتلن هؤلاء الثلاث علي بن أبي طالب ومعاوية وعمرو بن العاص (اسد الغابة – علي بن ابي طالب)

f) The martyrdom of Hadhrat Hussein رضي الله عنه, known as the incident of Karbalâ, occurred in Irâq. The murderers and the ones who had plotted his death and brought him over were all from Irâq. The first claims of the shia were made by a jew who portrayed himself as a revert to Islâm, viz. Abdullûh ibn Saba (also known as Ibn Saudah). Although he came from Yemen, the area he chose for laying the foundation of his false creed was none other than Irâq (Kûfa and Basrah) and Egypt[14].

g) the rise of the jabariyâh occurred in Irâq/Irân. The leader of this sect was Jahm ibn Safwân[15], who studied under Ja'd ibn Dirham[16] in Basrah. Jahm was from Khurâsân (Irân), and in the forefront of the call to overthrow the rule of the Banu Ummayyah.

h) Irâq was the birthplace of the sect known as the qadariyâh. The first recorded claims regarding the denial of Taqdîr came from Ma'bad Juhani in Basrah.[17]

i) The rise of Mukhtâr ibn Ubeid Thaqafi (the liar,) occurred in Kufa. Claiming to take revenge from the killers of Hadhrat Husein رضي الله عنه, he had thousands of innocent men, women and children slaughtered. He even laid claim to being a recipient of

---

[14] فلما قدم عبد الله بن سبأ البصرة نزل على حكيم بن جبلة، واجتمع إليه نفر، فنفث فيهم سمومه، فأخرج ابن عامر عبد الله بن سبأ من البصرة، فأتى الكوفة فأخرج منها، ومن هناك رحل ابن سبأ إلى الفسطاط ولبث فيه وجعل يكاتبهم ويكاتبونه، ويختلف الرجال بينهم، وذكر الطبري أن السبئية لما قرروا الزحف من الأمصار على مدينة الرسول صلى الله عليه وآله وسلم كان عدد من خرج منهم من البصرة كعدد من خرج من مصر (العواصم من القواصم – قول علي أن الخارجين على عثمان حساد طلاب دنيا)

[15] الجهمية: تنتسب الجهمية إلى الجهم بن صفوان من أهل خراسان ومولى لبني راسب، تتلمذ على الجعد بن درهم وكان كاتباً للحارث بن سريح، الذي أثار الفتن ضد الدولة الأموية في خراسان، وكان جهم يقرأ سيرته ويدعو إلى توليته، ويحرص الناس على الخروج (الدولة الأموية عوامل الإزدهار وتداعيات الإنهيار المؤلف : علي محمد محمد الصَّلاَّبيَّ)

[16] J'ad 'coincidentally' happened to be the first person to voice the filthy opinion that the Qurân-e-Majîd is a created word.

[17] عَنْ يَحْيَى بْنِ يَعْمُرَ قَالَ: كَانَ أَوَّلُ مَنْ قَالَ فِي الْقَدَرِ بِالْبَصْرَةِ مَعْبَدٌ الْجُهَنِيُّ (معارج القبول بشرح سلم الوصول)

revelation[18]. The brother of Hadhrat Abdullâh ibn Zubeir, viz. Musab ibn Zubeir finally had him killed.

j) The killing of thousands of leading scholars of the Tâbi'een, on the hands of Hajjâj ibn Yusuf Thaqafi occurred in Irâq.

k) The home of the qarâmita was Persia[19]. This sect was regarded as perhaps the worst sect of the shia, famous for their massacre of the Hujjâj and their abduction of the Hajar-e-Aswad in the year 317 A.H. for a period of about twenty-two years.

l) The issue known as *Khalqul-Quraan* (the claim that the Qurân is created) was spearheaded by a man from the qarâmita, Bishr ibn Ghayyâth Al-Marîth. In fact, as recorded in Al-Bidâyah[20], the first person to raise this issue was Ja'd ibn Dirham (of Khurâsân -Irân). He learnt it from Bayân ibn Sam'ân, who learnt it from Tâlût (the nephew and son-in-law of Labîd ibn Asam, the jew who practiced black magic upon Rasulullâhﷺ). Tâlût learnt it from his father-in-law, Labîd, who learnt it from a jew of Yemen.

Summarising the conspiracies, the trials, and the evils that arose from this area, Hadhrat Moulâna Sayyid Suleimân Nadwi رحمة الله عليه has written in Sîratun Nabi, the summary of which is:

'When one makes a deep study of history one seems to get the feeling that almost every astray sect and every major trial and evil that arose against Islâm somehow had its roots in the land of Irâq!'

---

[18] (المختار بن أبي عبيد) الثقفي الكذاب، الذي خرج بالكوفة، وتتبع قتلة الحسين يقتلهم. قال النبي صلى الله عليه وسلم: يكون في ثقيف كذاب ومبير فكان أحدهما المختار، كذب على الله وادعى أن الوحي يأتيه، والآخر: الحجاج (تاريخ الاسلام للذهبي)

[19] وفيها تحركت القرامطة وهم فرقة من الزنادقة الملاحدة أتباع الفلاسفة من الفرس الذين يعتقدون نبوة زرادشت ومزدك، وكانا يبيحان المحرمات (البداية و النهاية)

[20] قال ابن عساكر وغيره: وقد أخذ الجعد بدعته عن بيان بن سمعان، وأخذها بيان عن طالوت ابن اخت لبيد بن أعصم، زوج ابنته، وأخذها لبيد بن أعصم الساحر الذي سحر رسول الله (صلى الله عليه وسلم) عن يهودي باليمن، وأخذ عن الجعد الجهم بن صفوان الخزري (البداية)

However, from the above it should never be understood that Irâq produced nothing but filth. Rather, to confront the evil that continuously arose from Irâq, Almighty Allâh brought forth from that very land such giants of Islâm that in every era broke the backbone of these fitnas. On accout of these luminaries the land of Irâq was regarded as one of the major centres of Islâmic knowledge during the era of the Sahâbaﷺ, Tâbi'een and for many years thereafter.

What made Irâq and its inhabitants, i.e. the *majûs* (fire-worshippers) the centre of so much of evil?

The inhabitants of Irâq, before being conquered by the Muslims, were mainly '*majûs*' (fire worshippers). In the Ahâdith one finds clear mention that just as the majûs (fire-worshippers) were responsible for much of the attacks made upon religion in the previous Ummahs. So too shall it be in this Ummah.

Rasulullâhﷺ warned most emphatically,

لكل أمة مجوس[21]

'For every Ummah there have been Majûs, i.e. worshippers of the fire.'

1) Due to another hadith, which has been narrated on a similar pattern, i.e. '*Verily for every Ummah there is a test!*'[22],

---

[21] حدثنا علي بن عبد العزيز ثنا حجاج بن المنهال ثنا معتمر بن سليمان حدثني علي أبو الحسن رجل من أهل واسط ثنا جعفر بن الحارث عن يزيد بن ميسرة عن عطاء الخراساني عن مكحول عن أبي هريرة قال قال رسول الله صلى الله عليه و سلم (لكل أمة مجوس ومجوس هذه الأمة القدرية لا تعودوهم إذا مرضوا ولا تصلوا عليهم إذا ماتوا) قال المحقق حمدي بن عبد المجيد والحديث رواه ابن أبي عاصم في السنة والآجري في الشريعة والدولابي والحديث صحيح لشواهده

[22] إن لكل أمة فتنة (رواه أحمد)

the explanation of (‘*Verily for every Ummah there are majûs!*’) that comes to mind is that just as how in every Ummah there have been ‘*majûs* (worshippers of the fire) that stood in the frontline of evil, ensuring that ‘the Truth’ never spreads, so too shall it be in this Ummah, irrespective whether they expose themselves as open *majûs*, (i.e. fire/devil-worshippers/satanists, etc) or they hide behind the mysterious names of ‘illuminati’, ‘free-masons’, etc)

The *Majûs* (fire-worshippers) of Persia

The basic principles of the religion of the majûs, (Zoroastrianism, named after ‘Zoroaster’) at the outset appears quite similar to that of Islâmic belief, i.e. they believe in and worship a mighty Being that had created the entire universe, a Being that is good and rewards good. Their only difference is that together with this they also believe in a separate deity of evil, also uncreated, whose mission is to create chaos, mischief, etc. Ultimately the Diety of Good shall triumph, thus their worship is directed solely towards it, and they hold nothing but enmity and hatred for the God of evil.

Until this point, nothing about them appears so significant, that could have necessitated the mention of ‘*for every Ummah there are majûs*’, since their only error was their attribution of evil to another Being, whereas in Islâm the Creator of both good and evil is one, whilst the shayâtîn are mere instruments utilizes for the creation of evil. When only so much is understood regarding their faith, one in fact finds it difficult to understand why so many of them refused to accept Islâm, since the difference between the two faiths hardly appears major.

But when one looks deeper and understands which Being, according to them, is good and which is bad, which shall triumph and which shall fail, at that point the reality of this faith comes to the fore.

Majûs (Zoroastrians) turn towards a flame while praying. At the heart of a Zoroastrian place of worship burns a fire and where possible the fire burns continuously, symbolizing 'an eternal fire', 'a fire that shall always remain high'.

According to them fire represents the spiritual flame within us, and through fire are the ethical values of order, beneficence, honesty, fairness and justice created. As long as the temporal, outside fire remains burning high, till then shall the inside fire stay lit. Creation is a result of the 'fire!' A famous sentence in their set of beliefs is, 'God did not create the heavens and earth with dust and water, but rather with fire'! Fire is a source of light, and, in their understanding, light represents wisdom, while darkness represents ignorance. The passing of Zoroastrian ideas and values from one person to the next is symbolized by a new flame being lit from an existing one, or by a flame being passed from one person to the next.

To simplify it further, when Iblîs refused to prostrate to Nabi Aadam عليه السلام, it was merely on account of jealousy, since he felt himself alone worthy of being made vicegerent on earth. When he saw this honour being passed on to one created from dust he could not control his enmity, and vowed to prove that not only shall fire remain supreme over man, but that man himself shall bow to the service of fire, hold it high, and himself become its slave.

When Zoroastrians speak of the God of good, they are not at all referring to Almighty Allâh, but rather to Iblîs, their God of Fire, known to them as 'The God of Wisdom, Justice, and Order'. As for the God who is not of fire, (i.e. Almighty Allâh) that, according to them, is a God of darkness, intent on spoiling all the good of this world and the next; an evil God, who hates man; a God that shall eventually be destroyed. (*Na'ûzubillah*)

Many are mistaken into believing that the *majûs* (Zoroastrians) worship fire. Rather, they worship a 'being' whose symbol is 'fire', and thus direct their worship towards it.

As for the birth of Zoroastrianism, it is believed to have commenced in Southern Russia almost four thousand years ago. Its adherents then migrated south into Eastern Iran. Around the eight century BCE, the Persians and the Medes of Western Iran also adopted the religion. When the Persians conquered Babylon, they took the religion with them into Southern Mesopotamia (modern-day Irâq and a few surrounding areas).

The concept of New Year's Day comes from a Zoroastrian festival known as Naw Rauz (New Year's Day) which is celebrated every year around March 21 at the Northern Spring Equinox. In fact, many aspects of present-day Christianity hail from the rituals of the Zoroastrians, since Constantine, the king who carved out much of modern-day Christianity, was a Zoroastrian disciple, who had hypocritically accepted Christianity in order to ruin it from within.

Zoroastrians worship none other than Iblîs himself, and it is this ideology of theirs towards which the burning flame in the hand of the statue of liberty indicates, and it is this ideology which is shown world-wide in the opening ceremony of the Olympics, i.e. 'the Fire shall always remain high'.

This is the reason why they could never accept Islâm, since the Almighty of the Muslims is the one they detest the most, and the accursed Iblîs is the one they revere the most.

Another interesting feature of these people is that they would prefer lighting their fire on high open areas, mountains or hill tops, etc. and their worship ceremonies would be officiated by the 'Magi' (legendary

Zoroastrian priest). Add to the word 'Magi' a few extra letters and you are left with 'Magician', with 'cian' meaning 'ancient.'

The role of the 'Magi' would be to ensure that the fire never dies. Households would come to the fire-house, which the Magi would man, to light their own fires. Since they gave their lives to the 'Fire' it was only natural that the 'Fire' (Iblîs and his shaytâni forces) would reward them for their services, but their reward would only be superfluous, just as how today's Ashkenâzi jews, freemasons, etc, are rewarded.

Through the rewards offered by their false deity, the fame of the Magi spread beyond the borders of Iran. They were found to be unsurpassed in their knowledge of philosophy, history, geography, plants, medicine and events regarding the heavens. Their high moral standing, their wisdom, their ability to heal the sick and their years of learning made them legendary throughout the Middle East .

A particular feature of the Magi was their habit of always wearing the Taylasaan (Tayâlisa – a Persian shawl, which shall be discussed further) over their shoulders. The other amazing dress feature of the Magi was that they would have their faces covered, just as how today satanists cover their faces when in their temples.

Their mighty empire was known as the Sassanid Empire, and they were known to the Sahâbaرضي الله عنه as Banu-Saasaan. Islâm first penetrated Sassanid territory when Hadhrat Khalid ibn Walidرضي الله عنه invaded what is presently known as 'Irâq', and the battle of Qâdisiyah, which followed three years later, under Hadhrat Sa'd ibn Abi Waqqâsرضي الله عنه, led to the permanent end of Sassanid control of West Iran.

Finally in the year 644 (A.C) the mighty Sassanid Empire was brought permanently to the ground, with its emperor just managing to save his life, by fleeing to China. At the time of the death of Hadhrat Umarرضي الله عنه, almost the whole of the South Caucasus (the entire region of the

Persian Sassanid Empire) was captured. The Persian War ended with the conquest of Balkh. Beyond that lay what was known as the lands of the 'Turks' and still further lay China.

After the assassination of Hadhrat Umar, at the hands of a Persian slave,[23] almost the entire Sassanid empire, at various intervals, tried rising in rebellion, being spearheaded by their emperor, who had returned from China to co-ordinate the rebellion. These rebellions finally ended with the death of the emperor himself, killed by one of his own people, a miller, trying to snatch his purse. These rebellions clearly showed that many of the Zoroastrians were never going to be happy with Islâmic rule.

Long before the invasion of Persia had even began, Rasulullâh had made mention that Kisra, the Persian emperor, has been destroyed and there shall be no real Kisra after him, i.e. their empire was on the verge of collapsing. In fact, at the time of the birth of Rasulullâh, the Persian emperor had seen a dream in which he was shown that their empire shall only see twelve more emperors. In the era of Hadhrat Umar this became a reality and the mighty satan-worshipping empire, (known as the Persian Empire), evaporated .

Due to many of the inhabitants of this empire having enjoyed years of close contact with the shayâtîn, it was obvious that not everyone was going to happily accept Islâmic rule. Some satanists fled to neighbouring Zoroastrian countries, whilst others, upon the instruction

---

[23] According to some historians, and this was the view of the son of Hadhrat Umar himself, as well as a few of the Sahâba, the assassination of Hadhrat Umar was not merely a result of a verdict that had been passed by Hadhrat Umar regarding the slave, Abu Lu'lu Al-Majûsi, but was rather the result of a well-planned Persian plot to assassinate their most-hated conqueror (i.e. Hadhrat Umar), with Harmozân, a Persian leader, who had only accepted Islam after being caught, being at the center of the plot.

and guidance of the shayâtîn above them, disguised themselves as believers and hypocritically entered into Islâm, merely so that they could launch their attack against Islâm from within, as Paul, Constantine and others had done with the religion of Nabi Isa عليه السلام. Due to their satanic empire being destroyed, the attack of the majûs (satanists) against Islâm would now be through '*taqiyyah*' (concealing their true identity), and 'nifaaq' (hypocrisy).

Thus, when Rasulullâh ﷺ spoke of the *majûs* (fire worshippers/satanists) that shall operate in this Ummah, he ﷺ did not speak of a non-Muslim party, that shall openly worship the fire and believe in two Dieties, but rather of a group that shall appear in Muslim garb and with a pious outlook, but shall have kufr beliefs lurking deep within their bosoms. Their mission shall be the same as the majûs (fire-worshippers) that preceded them, except that their method of operation shall be different. Their attack shall be from within, which shall make it all the more dangerous, and the targets of their attack shall be innocent believers, who shall be deceived by their apparent piety, acts of worship, and profound knowledge.

Discussing the *majûs* of this Ummah, Rasulullâh ﷺ said:

ومجوس هذه الأمة القدرية لا تعودوهم إذا مرضوا ولا تصلوا عليهم إذا ماتوا

The majûs of this Ummah are the Qadariyâh!
If they fall sick, do not visit them, and if they pass away, do not perform their janaazah salaah!

This group, labelled as the 'Qadariyâh' due to their strange beliefs regarding '*taqdeer*' (pre-destination) appeared towards the end of the era of the Sahâbah رضي الله عنهم, and thereafter spread into about twenty-two different groups. The salient feature of this sect was their denial or their creating doubts with regards to the divine creed of *taqdîr*. Speaking of their different groups Ulema have listed the following:

واصلية وعمرية والهذيلية والنظامية والاموارية والعمرية والثمامية والجاحظية والحايطية والحمارية والخياطية والسحامية واصحاب صالح قبة

والمويسية والكعبية والجبائية والبهشيمية المنسوبة الى أبي هاشم ابن الجبائى فهي ثنتان وعشرون فرقة

Regarding the evil of this sect, many narrations have been recorded from Rasulullâhﷺ wherein the order was given to completely disassociate from these people. For this reason, the Sahâbaرضي الله عنه would even refuse to reply to the salaam of these people.

A mere glance at one of the leading figures of this sect, viz. Ma'bab Juhani, shall enable one to easily dissect this group and see through their guise of deception. Through the brief description of Ma'bad, that shall now be provided, there is hope that much shall be understood regarding the hypocrites that operate within Islâm, the strength of their propaganda, and the power and support they enjoy from all other shaitâni circles.

Ma'bad ibn Abdullâh Juhani
(a leading figure of the Qadariyâh)

Amongst the first to raise issues with regards to *taqdîr* was Ma'bad ibn Abdullâh Juhani, from Kufa (Iraq). He portrayed himself as a man of piety, ibâdah, and a reliable narrator. He was known to always frequent the gatherings of Hadhrat Hasan Al-Basri. He narrated Ahâdith from many of the Sahâbaرضي الله عنه. After his fame had spread to quite an extent, he began denying the concept of taqdîr, and spreading confusion amongst the masses of Basrah.

When Hadhrat Abdullâh ibn Umarرضي الله عنه was informed of his actions, he issued the following verdict regarding Ma'bad and others who followed his thought of mind:

فإذا لقيت أولئك فأخبرهم أنى برئ منهم وأنهم براء منى والذى يحلف به عبد الله بن عمر لو أن لاحدهم مثل أحد ذهبا فأنفقه ما قبل الله منه حتى يؤمن بالقدر (مسلم)

'If you meet them again, inform them that I have nothing to do with them. By Allâh, if any of them spends gold equal to Mount Uhad in charity, Almighty Allâh shall never accept it, until and unless he believes in taqdîr.'

Ma'bad later on proceeded towards Madinah Munawwara and attempted spreading his filthy beliefs there. He was so persistent on his view that he was ready to die for it. The Caliph, Abdul Malik ibn Marwân finally had him executed on account of his kufr beliefs.

Amongst the people who learnt from him and strove to spread his false claims was Ghailân of Damascus. After being threatened by Umar ibn Abdul Aziz رحمة الله عليه with execution he drew back, but on the death of Umar ibn Abdul Aziz رحمة الله عليه he again emerged. The Caliph, Hishâm ibn Abdul Malik, later had him executed.

Regarding Ma'bad, the words of Hadhrat Hasan Al-Basri most adequately describe his reality:

إياكم ومعبدا فإنه ضال مضل [24]

'Be aware of Ma'bad. He is astray and leading others astray.'

The actual reason behind Ma'bad holding so firm to his false belief, and the true identity of the people from whom he learnt this filth shall perhaps never be known with certainty, but one fact that stands out in his history, as well as the history of the innovators of the three main astray groups of Islâm, viz. the Shia, the Khawârij and the Jahmiya, is that they were all from Iraq.

Ma'bad's execution brought an end to his life, but his false beliefs continued spreading through the different sects that surfaced thereafter. Some of the Qadariyâh would deny *taqdîr* completely,

---

[24] تهذيب التهذيب – ابن حجر العسقلاني

claiming man has full control of his affairs, whilst others would claim that man has no control and will, whatsoever.

The views of the Qadariyâh, despite facing the opposition of the Sahâbah ﵃ and the most learned of the Tâbi'een, continued spreading, and over twenty sects of theirs became notorious. The Mu'tazila, Jahmiya, etc. who later arose would adopt from their claims, and thus share many similarities with the Qadariyâh.

What caused the false beliefs of one man to spread so fast and to such a great extent? Why did it not stop spreading with his death? What caused others to share the same conviction and fervour as Ma'bad? Could it be that the source from which Ma'bad had acquired his training was still alive, preparing others to do the same? Could it be that great, evil powers were behind the sect known as the qadariyâh, as well as being behind the rise of the Khawârij, the Shia, and the Jahmiyâh? Could it be that sinister forces within Irâq were behind the initial conspiracies against Islâm, or do you feel the views of Ma'bad were just based on a thought that occurred to him, for which he and those who came after him, were ready to lay down their lives?

After reading just a little regarding the life of Ma'bad and the influence he had in spreading the creed of the Qadariyâh, does the possibility now not seem strong that Ma'bad, the Qadariyâh and all the other sects that arose thereafter, from Irâq and surrounding lands, were nothing but satanic groups working in the guise of pious Muslims?

Due to having such sinister groups operating within Irâq/Iran, and its surrounding areas, these areas would continuously cause mischief and plot to weaken the foundation of the Islâmic Caliphate. Their mischief began as soon as Islâm entered their borders, i.e. during the era of Hadhrat Umar﵁ and peaked during the rule of Yazîd ibn Muâwiyah.

Amongst the mischief caused by these trouble-makers was their habit of laying complaints and branding false accusations against practically every leader appointed over them. Many unfortunately are only aware of the complaints they had laid against Hadhrat Muâwiyahؓ and his son Yazîd, whereas if one were to scrutinize the amount of times complaints came from this region and how each time it proved to be false, one would surely be more cautious regarding accepting or lending an ear to any of the accusations of the people of Irâq.

A brief summary of some of their accusations shall now follow, whereby one may understand the manner of their propaganda. An important point that should be noted from the following is that their accusations would be spread with great expertise, as though they were masters in the field of propaganda. For this reason, despite the amount of times that their claims would be proven false, Muslim leaders would still feel compelled to lend a slight ear to their new claims and thus send out teams to investigate.

The mischief of Irâqi hypocrites during the era of Hadhrat Umarؓ

Hadhrat Sa'd ibn Abi Waqqâsؓ (the conqueror of Irâq and one of the ten given the glad tidings of Jannah) was appointed over the people of Kufa in the era of Umarؓ. Within a short space of time, complaints began reaching Hadhrat Umarؓ regarding various aspects of his public and private life. They even complained regarding the quality of his Salaah! Hadhrat Umarؓ thus had him removed from his post and appointed Hadhrat Ammaar ibn Yaasirؓ in his place.

Hadhrat Umarؓ thereafter summoned Hadhrat Sa'dؓ and questioned him regarding the allegations levelled against him. When asked about

his Salaah he responded, 'By Allâh, I lead them in Salaah in the manner taught to me by Rasulullâhﷺ, without the slightest deviation. I lengthen the first two Rakaats of the Esha and shorten the last two. Hadhrat Umar expressed great happiness at his answers and remarked, 'I thought as much!' (i.e, I myself did not believe these allegations).

A delegation was also sent to Kufa to enquire from the locals regarding Hadhrat Sa'd and to see how many disliked his rule. To the amazement of the delegation not a single Masjid could be found supporting these allegations. Rather the people had nothing but praise for Hadhrat Sa'd. They finally met one man by the name of Usâmah ibn Qatâdah. He stood up and said, "Since you are asking in the name of Allâh, I feel obligated to speak. Sa'd does not take part in military expeditions; he does not distribute the spoils of war fairly, and he is not just in his rulings!"

When Hadhrat Sa'd came to know of what he had said, he remarked, 'I shall make three duas. O Allâh, if this man is lying and is merely trying to gain fame, then lengthen his life, lengthen his poverty, and let him fall into great calamities!' Thereafter, whenever this man would be asked regarding his condition he would reply, 'Old and in great difficulty. I have been afflicted with the curse of Sa'd!'

Abdul Malik ibn Umair mentioned, 'I have personally seen this man, with his eyebrows drooping over his eyes due to old age. He would interfere with young girls and poke them as they passed by. (Bukhâri/Muslim)

Hadhrat Ammar ibn Yaasir was appointed in the place of Hadhrat Sa'd ibn Abi Waqqâs. Within a short period of time, complaints against this most noble Sahâbi began reaching Hadhrat Umar from various quarters of Kufa. Amongst the accusations levelled against this

Sahâbi was that he was incapable of fulfilling his duties and he was not trustworthy! (Na'ûzubillah)

So many complaints reached Hadhrat Umar regarding him, as though the entire Kufa had turned against him. Hadhrat Umar thus summoned him to Medina Munawwara. A group set out with him on the pretence that they would stand in his defence, but when he reached Medina Munawwara he found them worse than the people he had left behind. They complained that Hadhrat Ammaar was incapable of fulfilling his responsibilities, knew nothing of politics, and was totally unaware of what role he had been appointed to fulfil. On seeing their hatred for their leader, Hadhrat Umar felt it best to remove Hadhrat Ammaar from his post.

Hadhrat Umar thereafter enquired as to whom they would prefer as a leader. They nominated Hadhrat Abu Musa Ash'ari. Hadhrat Umar acceded to their request. Within a year from the appointment of Hadhrat Abu Musa the complaints began again. As the complaints intensified Hadhrat Umar sent an order that Hadhrat Abu Musa step down from his post and had him re-appointed in Basrah.

Hadhrat Umar, despite his unique talent in ruling and recognising the talent and qualities of others, found himself confused as to how he could sort out the affairs of the people of Kufa. He complained to those around him:

إنّ أهل الكوفة قد عضلوني (الكامل)

The people of Kufa have rendered me helpless!

He also said, 'What is wrong with this group of one hundred thousand, that they are not content with any Amîr, nor can any Amîr live happily with them? After deep thought and consultation with those around,

Hadhrat Umarؓ asked Hadhrat Mughîra ibn Shu'bahؓ to take up residence in Kufa as its governor. Hadhrat Mughîraؓ remained governor over Kufa until the death of Hadhrat Umarؓ. Just before the death of Hadhrat Umarؓ, due to complaints received, Hadhrat Umarؓ made a decision to appoint Hadhrat Sa'd ibn Abi Waqqâsؓ once again over the people of Kufa. This decision was regarded as part of his bequest and carried out after his demise. Hadhrat Mughîraؓ remained governor of Kufa for just over two years.

In the place of Hadhrat Mughîraؓ, Hadhrat Sa'd ibn Abi Waqqâsؓ was re-appointed. The poisonous environment of Kufa and its surrounding areas however could never allow any leader to stay in peace. Soon after heؓ too was removed and replaced with Walid ibn Utbah. Walid had been a governor from the time of Hadhrat Abu Bakrؓ and at the head of numerous conquests in the era of Hadhrat Umarؓ. Until his appointment in Irâq, he had never been found guilty of any wrong.

Amazingly, as with many leaders before and after him, it was only the people of Irâq who would find something wrong with him. Through the efforts of this unique group of Irâqis he was finally brought to court accused of drinking liquor and being a *fâsiq* (an open transgressor).

The testimony of the Irâqis would always appear strong, thus the Caliph would be hesitant in rejecting their word. On the same note however he would neither be too keen to accept it, knowing well that accusations from the people of Irâq had always proven to be false.

These Irâqis exhibited no shame in leveling accusations, and had no regard for any personality. People generally only know of the accusations they had leveled against Yazîd, the son of Hadhrat Muâwiyahؓ, branding him an adulterer, a drunkard and even an apostate. The fact of the matter is that they spared none from their

poisonous tongues. Yazîd was not the first accused of being evil and unjust. This accusation had already been leveled against Hadhrat Sa'd ibn Abi Waqqâsؓ. Yazîd was not the first branded as a drunkard. Walid ibn Utbah was accused with the same. Yazîd was not the first accused of adultery. This accusation had already been leveled against Hadhrat Mughîra ibn Shu'baؓ

The people of Irâq, as Hadhrat Umarؓ had rightly said, left no leader exempt from their accusations and false propaganda. However, certain individuals were selected to receive the worst that their tongues could offer. Amongst them were Hadhrat Uthmaanؓ, Hadhrat Mughîra ibn Shu'bahؓ, Hadhrat Amr ibn Al-Aasؓ, Hadhrat Muâwiyahؓ, Yazîd, and in recent times, the last Caliph of the Islâmic world, Sultân Abdul Hamid.

The accusation against Hadhrat Amr ibn Al-Aasؓ, and the issue of *Tahkeem* (Arbitration)

The incident of *Tahkeem* (Arbitration) is one that is well-known amongst scholars. Unfortunately, the details of this incident have been mixed with many filthy, poisonous lies, and propagated with such strength, that for many it has become a fact-beyond-question. In the version that the persian/jewish-satanists ensured gets propagated, one finds a blatant attack being made upon the honour and noble character of Hadhrat Amr ibn Al-Aasؓ, an illustrious companion of Rasulullâhﷺ, a Sahâbiؓ who had the honour, after accepting Islâm, of being invited by Rasulullâh' to all major consultations, and only after hearing his opinion would Rasulullâhﷺ make a decision.

Unfortunately, due to the effort made behind the propaganda regarding him, many good Muslims and even certain scholars have

become doubtful of his sincerity. Certain individuals have even gone to the extent of labeling him as a traitor, a liar, a deceiver and a cunning fox. (Na'ûzubillah!)

Before proceeding further, it would be appropriate to first shed some light on the issue of Tahkeem, an arbitration that was carried out by Hadhrat Abu Musa Ash'ariؓ and Hadhrat Amr ibn Al-Aasؓ, (the conqueror of Egypt), to solve the dispute which had occurred between Hadhrat Aliؓ and Hadhrat Muâwiyahؓ and thus bring an end to years of in-fighting which had (according to what has been narrated) already claimed the lives of over seventy thousand believers, a figure which even the wars against the mighty persian and roman empires had not managed to produce.

When the battle of Siffin[25] was brought to an abrupt halt, each party was asked to send an arbitrator to discuss the situation and find some solution to end the bloody conflict that had begun with the death of Hadhrat Uthmaanؓ. Hadhrat Aliؓ sent Hadhrat Abu Musa Ash'ariؓ and Hadhrat Muâwiyahؓ sent Hadhrat Amr ibnAl-Aasؓ.

The details generally given for what occurred during the arbitration process, are as follows:

(Hadhrat Abu Musaؓ and Hadhrat Amr ibn Al-Aasؓ met, discussed the matter in great detail and finally decided to remove both Hadhrat Aliؓ and Hadhrat Muâwiyahؓ from their posts and leave the Ummah to then choose someone else for the Caliphate.

[25] A huge battle, in which Hadhrat Aliؓ and the people of Irâq fought against Hadhrat Muawiyaؓ and the people of Shaam, due to Hadhrat Muawiyaؓ not being prepared to pledge allegiance to Hadhrat Aliؓ, as long as the killers of Hadhrat Uthmaanؓ were not brought to trial and punished.

When the time came to make this announcement, Hadhrat Amr ibn al Aasؓ requested Hadhrat Abu Musaؓ to address the crowd first. Hadhrat Abu Musaؓ, after praising Almighty Allâh and sending salutations upon Rasulullâhؓ announced that he had decided to remove both Hadhrat Aliؓ and Hadhrat Muâwiyahؓ, and leave the Ummah free to elect a new leader.

After stepping back, Hadhrat Amr ibn al Aasؓ came forward and contrary to what had previously been decided, announced that he agrees with Hadhrat Abu Musaؓ as far as removing Hadhrat Aliؓ from his post is concerned. As for Hadhrat Muâwiyahؓ, it is his decision to keep him in his post.

When Hadhrat Abu Musaؓ heard this he became furious and a heated argument broke out between the two. The two parties returned to their leaders, informing Hadhrat Aliؓ of his removal from the seat of Caliphate, and giving Hadhrat Muâwiyahؓ the glad tidings of becoming Amîirul-Mumineen.

When the party of Hadhrat Aliؓ were informed of the decision, a huge number of them broke away from his party and put up their tent at a place known as Harurâ. This group became known as the Khawârij. Dissatisfied with the decision made by the arbitrators, they branded Hadhrat Aliؓ kâfir (disbeliever) and began making terrible attacks on his followers, going to the extent of cutting open the bellies of Muslim women, while still alive. Hadhrat Aliؓ made great attempts to bring them back under his authority, but when all efforts failed, he launched a severe attack upon them, which resulted in their almost total annihilation.)

These are the details which are generally in the minds of those who have a little knowledge of Islâmic history, due to man's quick perusal

through the books of history, without any concern of what is authentic and what is not, what is acceptable and what is not, what could be considered as probable and what could not.

Again, with just a little pondering over the above, keeping in mind the principles laid down for the acceptance of historical narrations, with the honour and integrity of the Sahâba رضي الله عنهم being at the prime, one shall quickly realise that much of the details of the above account are nothing but lies propagated by satan-worshipping persians, posing as soldiers in the armies of both parties.

A few of the events mentioned above, which obviously cannot be correct shall be listed below, intended merely as a guide, knowing full well that a thorough investigation of the incident shall surely result in more and more lies coming to the fore.

First lie regarding the Tahkeem: The Khawârij were angered by the deceit of Amr ibn al Aas رضي الله عنه

It has generally been understood that the Khawârij broke away from Hadhrat Ali رضي الله عنه due to their dissatisfaction with the ruling of Hadhrat Amr ibn al Aas رضي الله عنه, whereas the reality is that they had expressed their anger and dissatisfaction with Hadhrat Ali رضي الله عنه from the very beginning, i.e. from the time they were informed that both parties had agreed to arbitration. Thus, their anger was never with the decision made by the arbitrators, rather it was with the fact that the Muslim Ummah had brought an end to the in-fighting, which had already resulted in the deaths of thousands.

These filthy people were never going to accept any decision made by the arbitrators, since disunity within the Ummah was their prime objective. The basis of their entire mission was to divide the Ummah

and they were well aware that arbitration would burst their balloon. Criticizing the decision made by Hadhrat Amr ibn al Aas, and portraying him as a deceitful, cunning politician was done merely to formulate a better excuse for their breaking away from Hadhrat Ali.

The proof of this is what has been narrated in Al-Bidâyah that when the decision was made to allow Hadhrat Abu Musa Al-Ash'ari and Hadhrat Amr ibn Al Aas to arbitrate in the matter of the Ummah, Ash'ath ibn Qais was sent to inform all of this decision. When he came to the tribe of Banu Tamîm and read the message to them, Urwah ibn Uzainah stood up angrily and shouted out, 'How dare you allow man to decide in the matters of religion! Only Almighty Allâh is the One who decides!' Urwah then swiped his sword towards Ash'ath, but missed, with the blade landing on the behind of the horse of Ash'ath.

The division in the army of Hadhrat Ali began after this event, with thousands separating themselves and camping at the area known as Harûriyah. The evil perpetrated by this band finally compelled Hadhrat Ali to raise his sword against them, whereas just a few months ago, they formed a major part of his army.

In reality it was this very group that were behind the assassination of Hadhrat Uthmaan and the wars of Jamal and Siffîn. Until that moment they had been operating in the guise of noble men, constantly in prayer and recitation of the Qurân. At this point in history their guise was thrown off, and their identity exposed. Rasulullâh had warned the Ummah of this hidden threat, and he himself had mentioned that the first time the identity of these hypocrites shall be exposed is when they shall rebel against Hadhrat Ali.

Exactly as predicted by Rasulullâh, this filthy group of hypocrites surfaced, and as predicted, were halted in their tracks and brought to

their heels by Hadhrat Aliؓ and his faithful companions, but only after having wreaked great damage in the Ummah. After the war, when remarked that the hypocrites have now been eradicated, Hadhrat Aliؓ corrected him saying that this group shall in fact continue re-surfacing till the end of time, with its sole mission being to halt the progress of Islâm and the Muslim Ummah.[26]

Anyway, the actual purpose of mentioning the above is to show that irrespective of what decision the arbitrators would make months later, this group of hypocrites were never going to accept it, since their sole desire was to keep the Ummah divided, fighting amongst themselves.

During the incident of *Tahkeem* (arbitration) neither did Hadhrat Abu Musa Ash'ariؓ make a cowardly decision, nor did Hadhrat Amr ibn al Aasؓ deceive. Rather their gathering brought a halt to years of in-fighting which had already claimed the lives of close to one hundred thousand. The only group angered by their decision was that of the hypocrites, and it was these very people who would later disfigure the entire issue of *Tahkeem* (arbitration) and have historians record it with their fabricated versions.

Second lie regarding the *Tahkeem*: Hadhrat Abu Musaؓ and Hadhrat Amr ibn al Aasؓ had discussed the matter in privacy, but Hadhrat Amrؓ, later, in front of all, spoke lies regarding the decision they had reached

Narrations show that many Sahâbaؓ and prominent men were present at the meeting between Hadhrat Abu Musa Ash'ariؓ and

---

[26] عن حبة العرني قال لما فرغنا من النهروان قال رجل والله لا يخرج بعد اليوم حروري أبدا فقال علي مه لا تقل هذا فوالذي فلق الحبة وبرأ النسمة إنهم لفي اصلاب الرجال وارحام النساء ولا يزالون يخرجون حتى تخرج طائفة منهم بين نهرين (الدجلة و الفرات) حتى يخرج إليهم رجل من ولدي (لعله الامام المهدي) فيقتلهم فلا يعودون أبدا (تاريخ بغداد لاحمد البغدادي)

Hadhrat Amr ibn al Aasؓ, and that each detail of the meeting was recorded on paper. How then could it ever be possible for Hadhrat Amr ibn al Aasؓ to lie in front of the entire crowd, gathered to hear the decision, without a single person, from those present standing up at that moment, or even after, and explaining to both parties that his announcement was not true.

The purpose of arbitration was to unite both parties, with both parties accepting the decision taken by the man they had elected to decide on their behalf. If Hadhrat Amr ibn al Aasؓ had lied, why then did Hadhrat Abu Musa Ash'ariؓ not just say so. The words of Hadhrat Amr ibn al Aasؓ could never demand the obedience of the army of Hadhrat Aliؓ. Rather, that which Hadhrat Abu Musaؓ would decide for them, only that would they regard as binding and necessary to accept.

In arbitration matters, no one man can deceive, since each party shall only listen to the words of its own member!

Third lie regarding the Tahkeem**:** Both parties had initially agreed on removing both Hadhrat Aliؓ and Hadhrat Muâwiyahؓ from their posts, and to leave the Ummah free to choose their Caliph)

Hadhrat Muâwiyahؓ had, until now, never made a claim of being the Caliph. He himself had repeatedly said that when the killers of Hadhrat Uthmaanؓ would be brought to trial, he would be the first to pledge allegiance to Hadhrat Aliؓ. When Hadhrat Muâwiyahؓ had never laid a claim for the Caliphate, what then would be the need for Hadhrat Amr ibn Aasؓ and Hadhrat Abu Musa Ash'ariؓ to decide to remove both and let the Ummah choose a new leader!

He who was never in a post, how does one remove him from that post?

It would not even be correct to say that perhaps what is meant is that he be removed from his position as governor over Shâm, because the words attributed to Hadhrat Abu Musa﵁ and Hadhrat Amr﵁ clearly state they wanted to remove both, so that the Ummah could again decide who should rule over them. In an Islâmic state it is only the Caliph that rules over all. As for the governors, they shall remain governors only as long as the Caliph allows, thus they have no rule of their own. To remove a governor would have no significance, since his post depends upon the Caliph. If the new Caliph would choose to keep him, he would remain. If the new Caliph would dismiss him, he would be dismissed.

A different scenario of the *Tahkeem* (arbitration) has been narrated in the Musannaf of Abdur Razzaq as well as in the *Târikh* of Tabari, with a much stronger chain of narrators (sanad). In this narration clear mention is made that after agreeing upon choosing a new Caliph, Hadhrat Abu Musa﵁ presented the name of Hadhrat Abdullâh ibn Umar﵁ as a suitable candidate, but Hadhrat Amr﵁ did not agree. Thereafter, Hadhrat Amr﵁ presented the name of Hadhrat Muâwiyah﵁ as a suitable candidate for the Caliphate, but Hadhrat Abu Musa﵁ did not agree. Both parties then separated, since they could not agree upon a new Caliph. Had there been any truth to the normally-famous version that they had initially agreed to remove both Hadhrat Ali﵁ and Hadhrat Muâwiyah﵁ from their posts, what then would be the reason for Hadhrat Amr﵁ presenting the name of Hadhrat Muâwiyah﵁ to Hadhrat Abu Musa﵁ as a suitable candidate for the Caliphate? After agreeing on firing one, would one ever present that same person's name as a candidate for the position one had just fired him from?

The sanad of this narration is indeed much stronger than all the other narrations describing the *Tahkeem* (arbitration), thus to ignore it would truly be a great injustice to the field of proper research. The narration, as recorded by Abdur Razzaq, narrating from Abdullâh ibn Ahmad, narrating from his father, Imâm Ahmed ibn Hanbal, narrating from Suleiman ibn Yunus, narrating from Zuhri, is as follows:

فلما اجتمع الحكمان وتكلما قال عمرو بن العاص يا أبا موسى رأيت أول ما نقضى به من الحق أن نقضى لاهل الوفاء بوفائهم وعلى أهل الغدر بغدرهم قال أبو موسى وما ذاك قال ألست تعلم أن معاوية وأهل الشأم قد وفوا وقدموا للموعد الذى واعدناهم إياه قال بلى قال عمرو اكتبها فكتبها أبو موسى

قال عمرو يا أبا موسى <u>أأنت على أن نسمى رجلا يلى أمر هذه الامة فسم لى فإن أقدر على أن أتابعك فلك على أن أتابعك وإلا فلى عليك أن تتابعنى</u>

قال أبو موسى أسمى لك عبد الله بن عمر وكان ابن عمر فيمن اعتزل قال عمرو إنى اسمى لك معاوية بن أبى سفيان (المصنف لابن عبد الرزاق)

In this narration a completely different picture has been painted, quite contrary to what is normally mentioned with regards to a great Sahâbi lying and deceiving, an act which even the pagan Arabs would not do!

The above-mentioned text forms only a small portion of a lengthy narration, the crux of which is that when the time appointed for 'The Arbitration' drew near, the parties representing Hadhrat Ali رضي الله عنه and Hadhrat Muâwiyah رضي الله عنه arrived at the selected spot, known as Daumatul-Jundal. A special invitation was sent to Hadhrat Abdullâh ibn Umar رضي الله عنه, who had kept himself aloof from the conflict, and Hadhrat Abdullâh ibn Zubeir رضي الله عنه to attend and help the Ummah reunite. The invitation was accepted, and these two luminaries, accompanied by many of their friends and students, also presented themselves at the meeting. Nothing was decided in privacy. The discussions that took place between Hadhrat Amr رضي الله عنه and Hadhrat Abu Musa رضي الله عنه were witnessed by

many. In fact, Hadhrat Amr ensured that all important points and issues on which consensus had been reached, be written down.

The first major decision upon which consensus was reached was that the present Caliph steps down from his post, affording the Ummah the opportunity to unanimously choose a leader. The problem however arose when it came to choosing a new Caliph. Hadhrat Abu Musa Ash'ari proposed the name of Hadhrat Abdullâh ibn Umar, which Hadhrat Amr ibn al Aas was not prepared to accept. Hadhrat Amr ibn al Aas then proposed the name of Hadhrat Muâwiyah, which Hadhrat Abu Musa Ash'ari would not accept. The two parties thus separated without the arbitration proving successful.

(In this narration there is absolutely no mention of Hadhrat Amr ibn al Aas decieving or lying. Had the issue of preference been solely the strength of this narration over all the other narrations regarding the '*Tahkeem*', that would have indeed been sufficient for it alone to be considered and all conflicting narrations be left aside. However that is not the case. Besides the fact that this narration is backed up with a much stronger chain of narrators, there are many other factors also which demand it be given preferred and placed above all other conflicting narrations. Amongst those factors are the following:

a) This narration refutes the accusation laid against Hadhrat Amr ibn al Aas that he won the arbitration through deceit and blatant lies. Arguments and harsh words on many occasions occurred between the Sahâba, since they were all children of the same household, i.e. they were all from the illustrious fraternity of the Sahâba and were not bound to those laws of respect which we have been commanded to observe for the Sahâba. Princes, in the court of the king, may criticize, argue

> and even fight against each other, but dare any man from out of the royal family attempt to slap a prince or merely look at him with contempt! The Sahâbaرضي الله عنهم, due to the fervor each one had for establishing the truth, would many a time issue a harsh word against his fellow Sahâbi brother, but never would he dare lie or deceive.

The hearts of the Sahâbaرضي الله عنهم, as mentioned in Quraan, have already passed the tests of Imaan. The purity of their hearts had received certificates from the highest of quarters, i.e. from Almighty Allâh himself. Only that mind which has not as yet understood the strength of Almighty Allâh's declaration of purity could ever conceive such hearts to still be stained with filthy, hypocritical traits of deceit, lies, etc.!

Hadhrat Amr ibn al Aasرضي الله عنه occupied a most prominent position amongst the Sahâbahرضي الله عنهم. After his accepting Islâm, Rasulullâhﷺ included him amongst his selected confidants, with whom heﷺ would consult regarding all matters of importance. During the eras of Hadhrat Abu Bakrرضي الله عنه, Hadhrat Umarرضي الله عنه, and Hadhrat Uthmaanرضي الله عنه, heرضي الله عنه played a leading role as a leader in the conquests of prominent areas like Egypt, Al-Aqsa, etc.

Could any sane mind ever imagine a Sahâbiرضي الله عنه of this calibre concluding his chapter in the glorious history of Islâmic heroes with an act of deception, and that too, not just deceiving a few individuals or friends but rather the entire Ummah, the illustrious Sahâbaرضي الله عنهم around him, and all those who until that time had viewed him as a true leader and hero of Islâm?!

Could any sane mind ever imagine a Sahâbiرضي الله عنه of this calibre concluding his chapter in the glorious history of Islâmic hero causing untold harm to the cause of Islâm, that Islâm for which he had on so many occasions

thrown himself towards the tips of poisonous swords without any concern for his life?! Na'ûzubillah! The Sahâbaؑ were men of true purity and piety, and Hadhrat Amr ibn al Aasؓ was from amongst the elite of this illustrious fraternity.

b) Logically also, deception from the side of Hadhrat Amr ibn Aasؓ can never be conceived possible. The reason being that he only played the role of one member from a panel of two, chosen to arbitrate between two major forces. Even if he lied as to what had been agreed between him and Hadhrat Abu Musa Ash'ariؓ, his lie would hold no effect, since the party of Hadhrat Aliؓ would obviously only accept as true what Hadhrat Abu Musaؓ would report.

c) History itself shows that the arbitration never led to the appointment of Hadhrat Muâwiyahؓ as Caliph. Rather, after the assassination of Hadhrat Aliؓ, Hadhrat Hasan ibn Aliؓ was chosen as Caliph, and it was he who then handed the caliphate over to Hadhrat Muâwiyahؓ. What then was the purpose of Hadhrat Amr ibn al Aas deceiving and lying to Hadhrat Abu Musa Ash'ariؓ, and what did it achieve? The only logical answer would be that there was no deception and no lie. Both parties attempted choosing a new caliph, but they were unable to reach any consensus. The two parties thus returned to their lands, without agreeing upon a new leader.

Despite no agreement being reached, fighting between the parties did however came to a halt, due to a pact made soon thereafter between Hadhrat Aliؓ and Hadhrat Muâwiyahؓ, with each promising not to

launch any attack on the land of the other. Irâq would be the land of Hadhrat Ali ﷺ and Shâm would be the land of Hadhrat Muâwiyah ﷺ.[27]

The status and principles of *Târikh* (Islâmic history)

This discussion has become quite lengthy, whereas it was only intended as an example of how the enemies of Islâm have distorted so many historical narrations with their poisonous propaganda. In fact, many a time one shall find an extremely weak narration being given more prominence and being more well known than all other narrations on the topic, despite their chains of narrations being stronger and their being closer to the demands of the Shariah and logic.

The reason for this is that man is prone to remember and accept that which is oft-quoted, without much consideration to its authenticity. Even if one were later to be shown a more reliable narration, he would brush it off as fabricated, merely on the basis that it conflicts with what he has already been taught.

However it should never be felt that due to the lies and poison hidden within historical narrations, the entire subject of Islâmic history has now been rendered useless and without any purpose. This is not at all the case. Islâmic history plays a vital role in understanding many aspects of Islâm, and it serves as a unique tool to cultivate the awe of Islâm in one's heart, to create awareness within one of the plots of Iblîs

[27] (وفى هذه السنة) فيما ذكر جرت بين على وبين معاوية المهادنة بعد مكاتبات جرت بينهما يطول بذكرها الكتاب على وضع الحرب بينهما ويكون لعلى العراق ولمعاوية الشأم فلا يدخل أحدهما على صاحبه في عمله بجيش ولا غارة ولا غزو قال زياد بن عبد الله عن أبى إسحاق لما لم يعط أحد الفريقين صاحبه الطاعة كتب معاوية إلى على أما إذا شئت فلك العراق ولى الشأم وتكف السيف عن هذه الامة ولا تهريق دماء المسلمين فعل ذلك وتراضيا على ذلك فأقام معاوية بالشأم بجنوده يجبيها وما حولها وعلى بالعراق يجبيها ويقسمها بين جنوده

and his armies, and teaches one the modus operandi of the enemies of Islâm.

Understanding the status of Islâmic history, its level of authenticity, and the manner in which it should be utilized, is essential if one desires re-opening the pages of history and delving deep into the episode of Karbala. Thus before proceeding to the discussion regarding the era of Hadhrat Muâwiyahﷺ and the reasons for his selecting Yazîd as his vicegerent, it would seem appropriate to shed some light on the principles of the study of Islâmic history.

For this, the gist of two articles shall be mentioned, one as a footnote in Arabic[28], written by the great scholar of Islâm, Allâmah Zâhid

---

[28] Allahmah Zahid Al-Kauthari, after making great research into the incident which occurred between Hadhrat Khalid ibn Walid؄ and Malik ibn Nuwaira, in which Hadhrat Khalid؄ was accused of having him unjustly killed, felt it appropriate to shed some light on the reality of historical narrations, especially when it deals with influential men, and more especially when it deals with men from the Glorious eras of the Sahaba؄ and Tabieen. This advice was thus rendered in a booklet, titled العبر من التاريخ.the gist of which is as follows:

و امثلُ مَن كَتَبَ في السِير من رجال الصدر الاول موسى بنُ عقبة , و عليه يعَوِّلُ البخاريُّ , و قد اثنَوا عليه خيراً , الاّ انَّ رواياتِه عن ابن شهابٍ , و قد ذكر الاسماعيليُّ الحافظُ (بصيغة التمريض – الكاتب) انه لم يسمع منه شيئاً , و ابن شهابٍ تغلب عليه المراسيلُ في باب السِير و المغازي , و مراسيله شبه الريح عند ابن القطان و الشافعيِّ.

و امّا ابن جريرٍ الطبريُّ صاحب "التاريخ" فجليل القدر في الحديث و التفسير و الفقه , و لكنه لم يضمن صحةَ ما اورده في "تاريخه" بل قال في (5:1) فما كان في كتابي هذا مما يستنكره قارِئُه اَو يَسْتشنِعه سامعُه , من اجل انه لم يعرف له وجهاً في الصحةِ و لا معنىً في الحقيقة فليعلم انه لم يُؤتَ من قِبَلِنا , و انما اُتِيَ من قِبَلِ بعض ناقليه الينا , و انما ادّينا ذلك على نحو ما اُدِّيَ الينا" و قال هناك ايضاً "اذا لم نقصد بكتابنا هذا قصدَ الاحتجاج ..." فبهذا يُعلم انه تبرّأ من عهدة رواياته في "التاريخ" و حملها على اكتاف رُواتها له

Kauthari رحمة الله عليه, which shall prove extremely beneficial to the Ulema, and the other of Hadhrat Mufti Muhammad Shafee' Uthmâni Sâhib رحمة الله عليه, which was intended as a forward to a book Hadhrat had compiled at the end of his life, in refutation to the many who were relying upon historical narrations in passing judgement and leveling criticism against the illustrious Sahâbah رضي الله عنهم and those that came after them.

و محمد بن اسحاق صاحب "المغازي" اختلف فيه اهل النقد , و قد كذّبه كثير منهم , و كان ابو حنيفةَ و مالكٌ لا يرضَيانه , و من قوّاه في المغازي اشترط في رواياته شروطاً لا تتوفر في مواضع الريبة , و الجمهور على تقويته في المغازي بشروط معروفة , وروايات مثلِه يجب التروّي فيها و لو بالنظر الى رجال الاسانيد اليه , فراويتُه : زيادٌ البكّائي مختلَفٌ فيه , ضعّفه النسائي و تركه ابن المديني , و قال فيه ابو حاتم: لا يحتجّ به. و راويتُه الآخرُ : سلمةُ بن الفضل الرازي مختَلفٌ فيه ايضاً , يقول عنه ابو حاتم : لا يحتجّ به. و راويةُ سلمةَ هذا : هو محمد بن حُمَيدٍ الرازي , مختَلفٌ فيه , و قد كذّبه كثيرونَ أشنعَ تكذيب , و بطريقه يسوقُ ابنُ جريرٍ رواياتِ ابن اسحاقَ.

و اما هشام بن محمد الكلبي و ابوه و الواقديُّ فالكلامُ فيهم معروفٌ

و اما راويةُ الوليد بن مسلم : محمدُ بنُ عائذٍ الدمشقي فيقولُ عنه ابو داؤد : هو كما شاء الله (و هو ثناءٌ عليه)

و اما سيفُ بنُ عمرَ التميميُّ صاحب كتاب "الردّة و الفتوح" فمتروك الحديث عند ابي حاتم , و قد ضعّفه غير واحد , بل رماه ابنُ حبانَ بالوضع . و الراوي عنه شعيب بن ابراهيم من المجاهيل عند ابن عديّ و الذّهبي , و له اخبار فيها تحاملٌ على السلف. و الراوي عن شعيبٍ هذا السَرِيُّ بن يحيى , غير موَثّق , و هو شيخُ ابن جرير في رواياته عن سيف. و اما من فوقَ سيفٍ من الرجال فمجاهيلُ في الغالب.

فاذا كانت اسانيد ابن جرير في السِير كما ذكرناه تعيّنَ وجوبُ التّحرّي في رواياته في السِّير لا سِيَّما في مواضع الانفراد , فضلاً عن وجوب ذلك فيمن هو دونه في العلم من حملة السِير. فاليعقوبيّ (صاحب "البلدان") شِيعِيٌّ متحاملٌ , و ابو الفرج الاصبهاني صاحب "الاغاني" من رجال الاسمار , لا من مصادر صحيح الاخبار , كان يأتي بأعاجيبَ بِ "حدّثنا و أخبرنا" , و قد اتُّهِمَ , قال النُوبختِيُّ: كان اكذبَ الناسِ . (تمت)

(و قال في مقام آخر) و قد قلت في مقالٍ لي : انه لا يخفى على الباعث مبلغ سعي اعداء الاسلام في كل دور , و وجوه تجدّد مكرهم في كل طبقةٍ , فمِن الوان مكرهم في عهد تدوين الرواياتِ اندساسُ أُناسٍ منهم بين نقلة الاخبار , متلفّعين بغير ازيائهم لترويج اكاذيبَ بينهم ممّا يشوِّه سمعةَ الاسلام و سمُعة القائمين بالدعوة الى الاسلام , فراجت تلك الاكاذيبُ المدبَّرةُ على نقلةٍ لم يُؤتَوا بصيرةً نافذةً , فخلّدوها في الكتب , حتى ظلّ الكائدون يتذرّعون بها في كل قرنٍ للكيدِ بالاسلام , لكنّ الله سبحانهَ اقام ببالغِ فضلِه جهابذةً تَضعُ الموازينَ القسطَ لِتُعرف الأنباء الصافية العيارُ , من نَبَهْرجِ الاخبار , فأصبحت تعاليمُ الاسلامِ و أنباءُ الاسلامِ في حِرْزٍ أمينٍ مِن دَسِّ الدسّاسين عندَ مَن يَعْرِف أن يَزَنها بتلك الموازين. (من عبر التاريخ)

Hadhrat Mufti Sâhib ﷬ writes[29]:

'It has been explained above that it is not correct to judge the noble Sahâba ﷡, their personalities and to stipulate their rank, based only on historical narrations. This is because they hold a special position in the light of the Qur'ān and Sunnah because of their being the medium between Rasūlullāh ﷺ and the Ummah. History does not have such a rank, based on which this status could be lowered or increased. The meaning of this can never be understood to be that the science of history is totally unreliable and useless (the need and importance of it in Islām will be clarified later), but the reality is that belief and reliance has various stages.

In Islām, the level of belief and reliance that is placed on the Qur'ān and Mutawātir A<u>h</u>ādīth, that level of belief has not been placed upon the general A<u>h</u>ādīth. The rank of the statements of the <u>S</u>a<u>h</u>āba ﷡ is not that of the A<u>h</u>ādīth of Rasūlullāh ﷺ. Similarly, the rank of the belief and reliance on historical narrations is not the same as that of the Qur'ān, Sunnah or statements of the <u>S</u>a<u>h</u>ābah ﷡ proven through an authentic chain of narration.

If a hadith is found to be in (apparent) contradiction to the text of the Qur'ān, then it will be compulsory to interpret it (make ta'wīl) and if the interpretation is not understood, then it will be compulsory to leave that <u>H</u>adith out. Similarly, if a historical narration contradicts anything proven in the Qur'ān and Sunnah, then it will be left out or it will be compulsory to interpret it, no matter how reliable and dependable that narration is in historical terms.

---

[29] The translation of Hadhrat Mufti Muhammad Shafi' Sâhib's booklet has been done by Mufti Abdullah Mulla Sâhib of Dârul Ulûm, Azaadville, titled: 'The Rank of The Sahâbah ﷡'. The paragraphs quoted above have been copied directly from the English translation.

This grading of reliability and dependability does not lower the honour and importance of a science, but it enhances the Sharīah and the honour of its laws, such that the highest level of reliability and dependability will be necessary in order to prove them.

THE IMPORTANCE OF HISTORY IN ISLĀM

It is sufficient to gauge the importance of history in Islām from the fact that history and stories is one of the five important sciences of the Noble Qur'ān. The Noble Qur'ān gives special importance to explaining the good and bad conditions of the days of before and of past nations. However, the Noble Qur'ān has a unique style of explaining history and stories. Instead of mentioning the story in sequence, it divides the story, and narrates it together with other subjects. Also, the story is not mentioned just in one place, but the Qur'ān repeats the story in various places.

Through this unique method, the importance of history as well as its objective is clarified, i.e. the lessons behind each incident. Islām has taught special etiquettes in the writing of history, and has also stated that history, merely as a subject, has no real value. History becomes valuable only when one takes lesson from it.

After pondering over the treasure of Ahādīth and the Sīrah of Rasūlullāhﷺ, one shall find the entire treasure to be a history of the speech and actions of Rasūlullāhﷺ. When people began narrating incorrectly and fabricating A<u>h</u>ādīth, the need arose for the history of the narrators to be known, in order to protect the A<u>h</u>ādīth. The imāms of <u>h</u>adīth placed great importance upon this. Sufyān Thaurī رحمة الله عليه said that when narrators began to lie, we used history to oppose them.

That part of history, which deals with narrators of Ahâdith, (regarding whether they are reliable or not) has been given great importance in

the science of hadith. It even received a separate name, i.e. Asmā' ur Rijāl (The Names of Narrators).

The scholars of the Ummah that have objected and classified the criticism of narrators to be backbiting, their objection was only in the case where the criticism went beyond the limits of the Sharīah; where finding fault and disgracing the person without need and necessity became the objective; or where there was no justice and balance exercised in the grading of a narrator.

Just as the muhaddithīn felt the need to scrutinize the narrators, at the same time they placed a number of necessary conditions in order to keep this work within the limits of the Sharīah. These have been explained in detail by Hāfiz Abdur Rahmān Sakhāwī رحمة الله عليه in his book: الاعلام بالتوبيخ لمن ذم التاريخ.

In this book, he has mentioned that the first condition for levelling criticism is that the intention of the criticizer be correct. The intention should never be to show a fault of a narrator or to disgrace him, but rather the objective should be well-wishing and the protection of the Ahādīth.

Secondly, this work should only be done regarding that person who has a link to the narration of a hadīth; or in the case where one would be saved from harm due to the criticism levelled. If this is not the motive, then remember, it is no work of Dīn to make spreading the faults of someone a past time.

Thirdly, a scholar should only suffice on the minimum required in this field, which is that a particular narrator is weak, unreliable or he fabricates narrations. Extra words that point out a fault should be avoided. Whatever is said must only be said after thorough investigation and research.

In summary; that part of history that deals with the protection of hadīth, i.e. criticizing the narrators, jarh and ta'dīl, explaining their biographies, etc, forms part of those necessary sciences upon which the preservation of the Ahadīth of Rasūlullāh ﷺ depends.

As for that part of history, which has generally been referred to as 'history', which discusses all major events which occurred from the time the universe was created until present times, the incidents of the Ambiyā عليهم السلام, the lives of rulers and kings, revolutions in the world, wars, victories, etc, these incidents, have been narrated from generation to generation and some have come down in book form. Before Islām, this was nothing but a collection of stories, incidents and tales, which had no verification and none ever bothered regarding checking its authenticity.

Islām was the first to make clarification and research into the authenticity of the narration necessary. The Noble Qur'ān says,

إِن جَاءكُمْ فَاسِقٌ بِنَبَأٍ فَتَبَيَّنُوا (الحجرات)

If a sinful person brings you a report, verify its correctness.

Those who recorded the teachings of Rasūlullāh ﷺ, his speech and actions adopted this special method and made more than one science through which the hadīth of Rasūlullāh ﷺ was protected. Principles were also formulated for other matters that were narrated. In the general history of the world that Muslims compiled, these principles were considered as far as possible.

Muslims were the ones who accorded history the standing of being a proper and reliable science. Muslims taught the world to write history and to verify it. The scholars of the Ummah had scrutinized the narrations of the incidents of the Ambiyā عليهم السلام and then the Ahādīth. Not

only did they separate truth from falsehood, but also they established stages from highest to lowest in the true and reliable narrations.

They separated the part of history that deals with Ahādīth, i.e. Asmā' ur Rijāl, and made it a part of the science of hadīth. They also paid special attention to writing general history, the history of countries and kings, the history of various parts of the world and its geography.

There are great Imāms of hadīth and tafsīr, scholars and jurists, etc, who have written regarding the history of the Ummah. Thousands of small and big books were written, from which it is proven that this history also has a status in Islām.

In the first 40 pages of his book, Hāfiz Abdur Rahmān Sakhāwī رحمة الله عليه has made mention of the virtues and benefits of history in detail, in the light of the statements of the scholars and wise men. The greatest and most comprehensive benefit is to derive lesson; to realize the temporary nature of this world by pondering over the rise and fall of nations; to create consciousness of the great power of Allāh جل جلاله and to become aware of His bounties and blessings through the biographies of the Ambiyā عليهم السلام and the pious; and to inculcate within one the importance of staying away from disbelief and sin, by taking lesson from the evil end of the disbelievers and sinners.

Despite this science having so many benefits and virtues, none have ever accorded this science the status that the beliefs of Islām and laws could be drawn from it. No one ever accorded it such a status that historical reports could be used as proof in the laws of halāl and harām. Historical reports are not regarded as effective in those laws for which there is a need for Sharī proof. In addition, there is no path for historical reports to create doubt in any of the laws that have been proven from the Qur'ān, Sunnah, Ijmā or Qiyās.

The reason for this is that, although Islāmic history is not baseless tales, without a chain of narration, however two matters cannot be overlooked when studying history and when using it for one's objective. Those who overlook these two matters will use history incorrectly and will fall into the trap of many deviated groups.

The first matter is that the Ahādīth of Rasūlullāh ﷺ, i.e. his speech and actions which the Sahāba ﷺ have heard or seen, was a trust which they understood had to be conveyed to the Ummah. They thus paid special attention to every utterance and action of Rasulullâh ﷺ, and ensured that it remain preserved in their minds and hearts, as far as possible.

Besides this, the intense love that the Sahāba ﷺ had for Rasūlullāh ﷺ was such that they were not even prepared to let the water he ﷺ used for wudū' fall to the ground; they would rub it on their faces and chests. When they would protect the hair that separated from the body of Rasūlullāh ﷺ and his old clothing more than their own lives, how could it ever be fathomed that they would not give due importance to protecting the Ahādīth of Rasūlullāh ﷺ?

The immense love of the Sahāba ﷺ spurred them to protect his ﷺ every word and to care for his every hadīth, more than even their own lives. Almighty Allâh, for the protection of the words of His beloved messenger ﷺ, created a most noble group, possessing angelic qualities, numbering more than a hundred thousand, all with one mission, i.e. to ensure the protection and propagation of the speech and actions of a single personality, Rasulullâh ﷺ.

This privilege was not accorded to anyone before Rasulullâh ﷺ. Even if one were amongst the greatest of kings, then too no one would ever have the concern to listen to every word of his, attentively, remember it, and propagate it to others. The incidents of kings, conditions of countries and places, and the changes of times are definitely studied

and heard with interest, but who has the concern to remember them properly and propagate them as well? Therefore, historical incidents and narrations can never have the same status as that of A<u>h</u>ādīth!

Rasūlullāhﷺ was commanded to propagate the Qur'ān and the teachings of Risālat (known as the Ahâdith) throughout the world, and to the coming generations, until the Final Hour. For this purpose, Almighty Allâh blesses him' with such companions, who were filled with his' love and honour. Together with this, Rasūlullāhﷺ made it the obligation of every <u>S</u>a<u>h</u>ābīرضي الله عنه to convey whatever aspect of dīn they heard or saw from Rasūlullāhﷺ to the Ummah.

Then too, the danger remained, that when propagating a law, or when narrating from one person to the next, it could easily happen that a mis-quote would occur, or that a man could misunderstand a statement and narrate it according to his misunderstanding. To ward off this danger, Heﷺ issued a stern warning to the narrators of hisﷺ Ahâdith, that they were to exercise the utmost caution possible when narrating his' words and actions. Rasulullâhﷺ would constantly repeat the following:

من كذب على متعمدا فليتبوأ مقعده من النار

He who wilfully attributes something false to me should prepare his abode in the fire!

This severe warning made the <u>S</u>a<u>h</u>ābaرضي الله عنهم and the scholars of <u>h</u>adīth that came later so cautious in the narration of <u>h</u>adīth, that as long as a <u>h</u>adīth was not proven with very strong research, they stayed away from attributing it to himﷺ. The scholars that followed and arranged the A<u>h</u>ādīth in chapters and sections, selected only a few thousand A<u>h</u>ādīth, after great research, from the hundreds of thousands that they learnt.

In Tadrīb ur Rāwī p.12, Allāmah Suyūṯī رحمة الله عليه has written,

'Imām Bukhārī رحمة الله عليه said that he chose (the a<u>h</u>ādīth of) <u>S</u>a<u>h</u>ī<u>h</u> Bukhārī from a hundred thousand authentic (<u>s</u>a<u>h</u>ī<u>h</u>) and two hundred thousand unauthentic (ghayr <u>s</u>a<u>h</u>ī<u>h</u>) A<u>h</u>ādīth that he knew from memory. Subsequently, in <u>S</u>a<u>h</u>ī<u>h</u> Bukhārī, there are four thousand unrepeated a<u>h</u>ādīth.

Imām Muslim رحمة الله عليه said that he chose from three hundred thousand A<u>h</u>ādīth when writing his <u>S</u>a<u>h</u>ī<u>h</u>, in which there are only four thousand unrepeated A<u>h</u>ādīth.

Imām Abū Dāwūd رحمة الله عليه says from five hundred thousand A<u>h</u>ādīth of Rasūlullāh ﷺ he selected for his Sunan only four thousand A<u>h</u>ādīth.

Imām Ahmad رحمة الله عليه says that he chose the A<u>h</u>ādīth of Musnad A<u>h</u>mad from seven hundred and fifty thousand A<u>h</u>ādīth.

In this way, through natural means and in the shade of the wise administration of Rasūlullāh ﷺ, the A<u>h</u>ādīth of Rasūlullāh ﷺ were gathered in a unique, divinely-aided method and it became the second proof of the sharīah after the Qur'ān.

GENERAL HISTORY COULD NEVER ACQUIRE THIS STATUS!

This is because, firstly, there was no reason for people to give importance to remembering general incidents and events and then to convey them to people, exactly as they had heard.

Secondly, if the historians had to judge and scrutinize historical reports and record them with the strict research that <u>h</u>adīth narrations require, and if only three or four thousand narrations were chosen from four hundred thousand in A<u>h</u>adīth, then in historical narrations, not even four hundred would have remained! Ninety-nine percent of historical

narrations would be forgotten and obliterated and many worldly and religious benefits attached to them would have been lost.

This is the reason why the books of the Imāms of Ah̲adīth alone have the status of being principle, reliable works. Those narrators that have been classified as weak in the field of Ahâdith, when it comes to history, these narrators are also accommodated and their narrations are given consideration.

Wāqidī and Sayf Ibn Umar have been classified weak in narrating h̲adīth. In fact, they have been criticized quite severely. However, when it comes to history, the Imāms of Ah̲adīth do not find any problem in narrating from them.

In the science of history, all types of narrations are gathered under each chapter, without any real research and inquiry regarding its strength. Scholars who are taken to be leaders in research, inquiry, and investigation in the sciences of the Qur'ān and Sunnah, when they write a book in the field of history, then although they do not give place to baseless stories and tales, however, they do not over-exert themselves in researching the lives of the narrators and checking the criticism levelled against them, as they would have done, had it been Ahâdith that were being narrated.

Had these scholars exercised such caution in history as they did when it comes to the science of Ahâdith, then ninety nine percent of history would have been lost from the world. The world would then have been left deprived of the benefits, lessons, wisdoms, etc, that are linked to this science.

Also, since no Shar'ee law was ever going to be extracted from the books of history, no real need for such caution and research was ever felt. That is why the Imāms of Jarh̲ and Tadīl (scholars who were

famous in describing narrators) have also adopted a wide, accepting stance in the science of history. The famous Imām of H̲adīth and Us̲ūl ul H̲adīth, Imām Ibn S̲alāh̲ رحمة الله عليه states in his book Ulūm ul H̲adīth,

وغالب على الأخباريين الاكثار والتخليط فيما يروونه . (علوم الحديث ص ٢٦٣)

This aspect is dominant among the historians that they gather many narrations in which authentic, unauthentic, and all types of narrations are mixed.

Allamah Ibn Kathīr رحمة الله عليه was a famous Imām and well known researcher. He had an outstanding quality of researching and investigating narrations. However, when this very same luminary writes his history work, Al Bidāyah wan Nihāyah, then this level of investigation and inquiry does not remain. In fact, he himself attested to this fact, with the following statement, regarding some of the historical narrations in his book:

"I myself have doubt about their authenticity. However, since Ibn Jarīr T̲abarī رحمة الله عليه and others have transmitted these narrations before me, I have thus merely followed suit. Had they not mentioned these narrations, I would have not recorded it in my book."

It is quite apparent that in the research of a hadīth, he would have never said that despite doubting its authenticity, just because some previous author had mentioned it that is why he wrote it.

This is despite the fact that Ibn Kathīr رحمة الله عليه has refuted many narrations of T̲abarī رحمة الله عليه and criticized them in Al Bidāyah wan Nihāyah. All these points testify to the fact that in the field of history, those who criticize some narrations, they too have regarded it appropriate to gather as many narrations as possible regarding an incident, under one chapter, despite it being weak or even possibly fabricated.

This is not the co-incidental error of any individual, but this is the line of thinking of all the Imāms of the science of history, that it is no fault to mention weak, unreliable narrations in the science of history without criticizing them. The reason for this is that they understood well that beliefs and laws of the sharīah are not proven through history. Rather, its purpose is that man takes lesson from it, and learns from the errors of those who had already slipped.

If a person desires using these narrations as proof for a ruling that deals with Islāmic belief or practical deeds, then it is his responsibility to adopt the same laws of scrutinizing the details of each and every narrator, as is necessary in the narration of <u>h</u>adīth.

Without doing this, how could it ever be permissible to draw rulings from historical narrations, just on the basis of a narration being found in the history book of some reliable Imām of <u>h</u>adīth!

(End of quotation from Maqâm-e-Sahâbahرضي الله عنهم)

....

Crux of the entire discussion

Every science and every book occupies an important position, but as long as the principles of that science are not understood, the usage of the books written in that science could easily prove detrimental.

History occupies a lofty position in the sciences of Islâmic knowledge, due to the immense benefit it provides. It too, however, is governed by principles. If these principles are not understood and adhered to, the science of history could easily lead one to straying far from the path of the truth, which eventually ends with one criticizing the Ambiyahعليهم السلام and Sahâbaرضي الله عنهم, who have already received their pass-certificates from The Knower of All Secrets, Almighty Allâh, himself.

A book of history can never be regarded as a book of Ahâdith, and its narrations can never to be regarded immune from being fabricated or alteration, irrespective of who the author may be. No book of history has the right to be regarded as '*Sahîh*' (authentic)!

The narrations of history shall be governed by the principles of the Quraan and authentic Ahâdith, sayings of the Sahâba, statements of the Tâbi'een, Tabe'-Tâbi'een, and great scholars of Islâm, and finally common sense. If it is found contradicting any of the above, it shall be subjected to '*ta'weel*' (interpretation). If interpretation proves difficult, it shall be discarded, since its chain of narrators offer no guarantee of the authenticity of the narration. The most that could be said is that it has a fifty percent chance of being true, and a fifty percent chance of being fabricated. Due to the chance of being fabricated being so high, there is no reason to demand the narration being accepted, especially when it contradicts solid evidence, and is itself surrounded by so much of contradiction.

Keeping the above principles in mind, one shall find the objections levelled against the illustrious Sahâba, merely on the basis of historical narrations, having no authenticity whatsoever!

The demand however is that these principles not only be remembered when it comes to the accusations levelled against the Sahâba, but rather these principles are to be considered before lending credence to any accusation made, against any individual, irrespective of creed, colour, and position.

Together with this, it is vital that one keeps in mind that the evil Persian/jewish satanists who were operating in full-force during the era of Hadhrat Uthmaan and Hadhrat Ali, they were not going to

suddenly disappear from the scene and stop their mischief. Rather, their evil would grow stronger with the passing of each day.

Creating fights amongst the Muslims was their ambition, and they were prepared to do anything to achieve that goal. When studying any incident of conflict between Muslims, which occurred after the era of the Khulafâ-e-Râshidînرضي الله عنهم, it is imperative that one bears in mind this group of hypocrites, and first check if perhaps their filthy hand was not operating from behind the scene.

The rise of the Khawârij

After the "*Tahkeem*" (Arbitration) failed to reach a unanimous decision, Hadhrat Aliرضي الله عنه and Hadhrat Muâwiyahرضي الله عنه, after a few more skirmishes, agreed to halt the in-fighting, and not to contest for land which was already under the opposing party's rule. The people of Irâq and other areas would still refer to Hadhrat Aliرضي الله عنه as "Amir-ul-Mu'mineen", whilst the people of Shaam would address Hadhrat Muâwiyahرضي الله عنه with the title of "Amir". The Ummah finally found some relief from the years of internal conflict that had already claimed the lives of thousands. The only ones that were not happy were the hypocrite Persian/Jewish Satanists, who had made it their ambition to break the strength of the Ummah through internal conflict.

The only way to now re-initiate the internal conflict amongst the Muslims was to have all those personalities assassinated, who had taken the Ummah out of the vicious waves of turmoil. The three personalities who were viewed as the greatest threats to the plot of the Persian Satanists, and whose being assassinated was vital for their plans, were:

1) Hadhrat Ali
2) Hadhrat Muâwiyah
3) Hadhrat Amr ibn al Aas

As long as portraying the love of Hadhrat Ali had helped the cause of the Persian Satanists, they were in the front line of those singing his praises, attributing to him divine qualities and leveling the worst sort of criticism against all who had prevented him taking his so-called 'destined' place as the 'true first Caliph of Islâm. (*Na'uuzubillah!*). But, as soon as they percieved Hadhrat Ali being a barrier to their filthy motives, they forgot all their claims of love and switched to the other extreme of branding him and all his loyal followers as "*kâfir*". (*Na'uuzubillah!*). In fact, some of these hypocrites went as far as slaying Hadhrat Ali's close companions, just on account of their remaining loyal to his command.

A glance at the hypocritical traits and filthy minds of the Khawârij

These hypocrites had portrayed themselves as the most pious, most learned, and most loving and loyal from the warriors of Hadhrat Ali. The marks of lengthy sajda would be clearly visible on their foreheads, their continuous recitation of Qurân earned them the title of "Qurra (The Reciters)", and their fervor for fighting was unique. But, as soon as the Ummah accepted the decision of "Tahkeem (Arbitration)", which brought a temporary halt to the years of in-fighting, their true colours came to the fore.

Without giving any thought to the love and honour they had for so many years portrayed for Hadhrat Ali, eight thousand of these so-called "Qurra (Learned men of the Qurân)', together with their families

and friends, broke away from his army, and refused to even lend an ear to his answers to the objections they had. Even the answers of Hadhrat Abdullâh ibn Abbâsﷺ, who the entire Ummah has accepted as the "Ocean to the knowledge of the Qurân", his answers too could not break their stubbornness, merely due to it being based, not on ignorance, but rather on hypocrisy.

The Khawârij refused to shift from their position unless and until Hadhrat Aliﷺ would accept his error in agreeing to the "Tahkeem", and would openly repent from his act of "kufr" (Na'uuzubillah), which he had, according to them, committed by allowing "man" to arbitrate, whereas according to their concocted understanding, "the only arbitrator is Allâhﷻ".

Hadhrat Aliﷺ obviously would never accept these absurd demands, and the Khawârij were never going to alter their stance.

After the "Tahkeem (Arbitration)" ended without any unanimous result, Hadhrat Aliﷺ initially intended setting off in the direction of Shâm, attempting once more to force the people of Shâm into pledging their allegiance. As his army moved away from Irâq, the Khawârij found an opportunity to vent their anger and went wild in their massacre of Muslim women and children left behind.

Amongst those brutally slaughtered by the Khawârij was the prominent Sahâbi, Hadhrat Abdullâh ibn Khabbâbﷺ, together with his pregnant wife. On their way to execute this noble Sahâbiﷺ, they happened to pass by swine, belonging to some Zimmi (non-Muslim citizen). One of the men struck it with his weapon, tearing its skin apart. A so-called "pious" man of the group rebuked him on his action and sent him to the Zimmi, to pay the price of the animal, and ask for pardon. A while thereafter, one of the men picked up a date that fell from a nearby

tree, and began chewing it. His friends rebuked him and forced the date out, saying, “What, without paying its price?” (This was the condition of their outward piety. As for the condition of their hearts and soul, the action that followed is more than sufficient to explain its filth and hypocrisy!)

They then brought Hadhrat Abdullâh ibn Khabbâbؓ forward, and mercilessly severed his neck from his body. As they approached his wife, she scream out, ‘Do you not fear Allâhﷻ! I am a pregnant woman!” Her plea was of no avail, since these were not men in front of her, but rather animals. They cut her belly open, exposing the foetus! (May Almighty Allâh deal with them as they deserve!)

The filthy actions of these animals caused Hadhrat Aliؓ to stall his plans of battle against the people of Shâm, and instead turn his attention to the Khawârij, who had once upon a time, formed part of his elite force and close confidants. Due to having for so long enjoyed such a close relationship with these people, Hadhrat Aliؓ felt it extremely difficult to suddenly lift his sword against them. He thus sent Harb ibn Murrah Abdi to discuss the matter with them, but he too was mercilessly slaughtered. Hadhrat Aliؓ was now forced to engage them in battle.

Before the battle could begin, Hadhrat Aliؓ announced that if the killers of his companions were handed over, he would leave the rest unharmed. The Khawârij boldly answered that all of them had killed his companions, and were now desirous of spilling his blood as well.

Qais ibn Sa’d ibn Ubâdahؓ, with great feeling, warned them of the consequences of their actions, followed by the advices of Hadhrat Abu Ayub Ansaariؓ, and finally by the eloquent and heart-rendering speech of Hadhrat Aliؓ himself, but all ended in vain.

Hadhrat Ali ﷺ then ordered Hadhrat Abu Ayub Ansâri ﷺ to lift up a flag of protection for the Khawârij, and announced that whosoever walks towards the flag shall be spared. Similarly, whosoever walks towards Irâq and Madâ'in, he too shall be spared. This announcement proved detrimental to the Khawârij, as majority of their men deserted their ranks and sped towards safety. The Khawârij were now left with just less than a thousand warriors, and against the force of Hadhrat Ali ﷺ, this number proved too insignificant. Seven from the army of Ali ﷺ attained martyrdom, whilst on the side of the Khawârij, not a single soul was spared, from either death or severe injury.

The shayâtîn had deceived these Khawârij to such an extent, that even as they were being pierced, at that moment too they remained adamant that they alone were on the truth. Hadhrat Abu Ayub Ansaari ﷺ, after stabbing his spear through the chest of a Khawâriji, exclaimed, "Go straight to the fire, o enemy of Allâh!" To his amazement, the Khawâriji, with his last worldly words, replied, "Soon you shall see who is more deserving of the fire!"

After the battle, Hadhrat Ali ﷺ took a walk amongst the dead, saying, "Woe be to you! The one who has deceived you has truly caused you the greatest of harm!" Someone asked, "Who had deceived them?" Hadhrat Ali ﷺ replied, 'Shaytân and evil souls that had given them false hopes, made their evil deeds seem noble, and deceived them into believing eternal success and victory was destined for them." Hadhrat Ali ﷺ thereafter ordered that the wounded of the Khawârij, numbering over four hundred, be attended to.

The Khawârij once formed a great part of the army of Hadhrat Ali ﷺ, thus the relationship that existed between them and the true followers of Hadhrat Ali ﷺ was very strong. To raise the sword against one's own

friends was obviously very hard on the heart, and after the battle many of Hadhrat Ali's own men were to be found gloomy, knowing that they had just killed their own friends.

To remove their grief, Hadhrat Ali ﷺ informed them that Rasulullâh ﷺ had predicted that such a group would one day rise, who shall apparently have all the traits of piety, whereas in reality they shall have no relationship whatsoever with Islâm. They shall be the worst of people and the ones that shall kill them shall attain immense reward. Hadhrat Ali ﷺ explained that Rasulullâh ﷺ had even described the features of the leader of this group, and had made special mention of a bulge on his hand. He then sent out scouts to search for such a man amongst the dead, explaining that if such a man is not found, it shall be proof that they were wrong in their attack, but if they do find this man, then they should understand that they had been selected to kill the worst of men.

After an exhaustive search, the man described by Rasulullâh ﷺ was pulled out from under some corpses. As soon as Hadhrat Ali ﷺ's eyes fell upon the man's body, he fell straight into sajda, and rose only after spending a long time thanking and glorifying Almighty Allâh. The feelings of remorse that had gripped his men now disappeared.

The number of Khawârij killed during this encounter was close to six hundred, and about four hundred were injured. What do you think happened to the rest of them? Do you think they just disappeared? Nay, they just stepped into the dark for a brief while, waiting for the next opportunity to strike and reignite the flames of disunity that had been burning within the Ummah for so many years.

The assassin of Hadhrat Umar ﷺ had come from Irâq/Iran. The killers of Hadhrat Uthmaan ﷺ hailed from Egypt and Irâq/Iran. The hypocrites

who ignited the wars of Jamal and Siffin were men from Irâq/Iran, who later took the name of Khawârij. Now, when it came to the assassination of Hadhrat Ali, who else could one expect to step forward for this most heinous deed, except one from Irâq/Iran.

After a few more encounters between Hadhrat Ali and Hadhrat Muâwiyah, a truce was finally concluded, which demanded that the in-fighting be brought to an immediate halt. The hypocrite enemies of Islâm realized that their only hopes for re-igniting the flames of war amongst the Muslims now lay in the assassination of Hadhrat Ali, Hadhrat Muâwiyah, and Hadhrat Amr ibn Aas. Three men from the Khawârij met to lay out the plans for a co-ordinated strike upon these three luminaries at one and the same time.

It was decided that ʿAbdur Ra<u>h</u>mān Ibn Muljim will martyr Hadhrat ʿAli, Bark Ibn ʿAbdullāh will slay Hadhrat Muawiyah and ʿAmr ibn Bark will kill Hadhrat ʿAmr ibn ʿAs. The 17th of Rama<u>d</u>ān 40 A.H was the day set to carry out this task.

The martyrdom of Hadhrat Ali

It was decided that ʿAbdur Ra<u>h</u>mān Ibn Muljim will martyr Hadhrat ʿAli, Bark Ibn ʿAbdullāh will slay Hadhrat Muawiyah and ʿAmr ibn Bark will kill Hadhrat ʿAmr ibn ʿAas. The 17th of Rama<u>d</u>ān 40 A.H was the day set to carry out this task.

Many years previously, Rasulullâh ﷺ had asked Hadhrat Ali if he was aware of who the most wretched man was. Hadhrat Ali replied that it was the man who stood up to slaughter the camel of Nabi Salih, in lieu of a few nights of enjoyment with a woman renowned for her

beauty. Hadhrat Ali's answer was derived from the verse of Surah Al-Dhuha, wherein Almighty Allâh states:

"Then the most wretched man stood up (intending to slaughter the camel of Salih)"

Rasulullâh then asked Hadhrat Ali if he was aware who the second most wretched man is. Hadhrat Ali expressed ignorance, upon which Rasulullâh himself gave the answer, with the following sentence:

"The man who shall murder you!"[30]

To assist with the assassination, Ibn Muljim brought two other khārijis; Shabīb Ibn Najdah Harūrī and Wardān into the plot. On Friday night, 17th Ramadān 40 A.H, the three of them hid in the Jāmiʿ Masjid of Kufa. Hadhrat ʿAlī entered the Masjid at the time of Fajr and began awakening the people for salāh as normal. Shabīb Ibn Najdah Harūrī came out and struck Hadhrat ʿAlī with his sword causing him to fall in the mihrāb. ʿAbdur Rahmān ibn Muljim came forward and dealt a second blow with his sword. The beard of Hadhrat ʿAlī was soaked in blood. He shouted, "Catch my killer!" Wardān and Shabīb Ibn Najdah Harūrī fled but ʿAbdur Rahmān ibn Muljim was caught. Hadhrat ʿAlī was brought to his home and ʿAbdur Rahmān ibn Muljim was presented before him. He said, "If I die, kill him and if I remain alive, I shall mete out an appropriate punishment myself!"

Rasulullâh had in fact described the details of the assassination of Ali to such an extent, that Hadhrat Ali himself, just a few days before his assassination, was found saying,

---

[30] المقصد العلي في زوائد أبي يعلى الموصلي للهيثمي

"What is keeping the 'most wretched' back? Why is he delaying? By Allâh! Soon this beard of mine shall be drenched with the blood of my neck!

When hope of his life came to an end, he called his sons and made a bequest to them regarding taqwā (piety), good deeds and service to religion. Someone asked, "O noble one, shall we pledge allegiance at the hands of Hadhrat Hasan after you?" He replied, "I do not command you to do so, nor do I prohibit you. Do what is appropriate!"

He ﷺ was reciting the following verse when he passed away,

فَمَن يَعْمَلْ مِثْقَالَ ذَرَّةٍ خَيْرًا يَرَهُ ۞ وَمَن يَعْمَلْ مِثْقَالَ ذَرَّةٍ شَرًّا يَرَهُ

Whoever does any good act (even) to the weight of a particle, he shall surely see it!

And whoever does evil (even) to the weight of a particle, he too will see it!

He was 63 years of age and he held the post of caliphate for approximately 4 years and 9 months. The janāzah salāh was performed by Hadhrat Hasan ﷺ and according to the preferred narration of Ibn Kathīr ﷺ he was buried in the inner part of the Dār al Khilāfah, Kufa.[31] May Allāh ﷻ be pleased with him.

After the demise of Hadhrat ʿAlī ﷺ, Hadhrat Hasan ﷺ called for ʿAbdur Rahmān Ibn Muljim. ʿAbdur Rahmān Ibn Muljim said, "I took a promise to also kill Muāwiyah. If you permit, I want to carry this duty out as well. I promise that if I remain alive, I shall definitely come to you."

[31] Some shīʿās think that the grave of Hadhrat ʿAlī ﷺ is in Najaf. Ibn Kathīr ﷺ has classified this view to be baseless. He then narrates from Khatīb Baghdādī ﷺ that the grave in Najaf attributed to Hadhrat ʿAlī ﷺ is actually that of Hadhrat Mughīrah Ibn Shuʿbah ﷺ. Besides this, there are various narrations regarding the place of burial of Hadhrat ʿAlī ﷺ. See Al Bidāyah wan Nihāyah vol. 7 pp.329,330. – [Qādī Zayn ul ʿAbidīn Mirthī ﷺ]

Hadhrat Hasan ؓ rejected this request and told ʿAbdullāh Ibn Ja’far ؓ to kill him.

Abdur Rahmān ibn Muljim had so much conviction on his baseless belief that at the time of his execution he was reciting Sūrah ʿAlaq and he was saying, “I do not want to keep my tongue negligent of the remembrance of Allāh at this time!”

The friend of ʿAbdur Rahmān ibn Muljim, Bark ibn ʿAbdullāh reached Damascus. The very same day, at the same time, he attacked Hadhrat Muāwiyah ؓ when he ؓ emerged from the Masjid after Fajr. Hadhrat Muāwiyah ؓ was slightly injured but recovered quickly. Bark ibn ʿAbdullāh was caught and killed. After this incident, Hadhrat Muʿāwiyah ؓ got a room made for himself in the Masjid and appointed a guard that would be on duty at the time of salāh.

The other friend of ʿAbdur Rahmān Ibn Muljim, ʿAmr ibn Bark, reached Egypt and he too attempted to fulfil his promise at the appointed time. Coincidentally, that day, on account of illness, Hadhrat ʿAmr ibn ʿĀs ؓ could not come to the Masjid. Khārijah ibn Abū Habībah came instead and led the salāh. ʿAmr ibn Bark thought that Khārijah ibn Abū Habībah was Hadhrat ʿAmr ibn ʿĀs ؓ and attacked him lethally. ʿAmr ibn Bark was caught and killed.

After the assassination of Hadhrat Ali ؓ, the people of Irâq pledged allegiance at the hands of Hadhrat Hasan ؓ, whilst the people of Shâm pledged their allegiance to Hadhrat Muâwiyah ؓ. Hadhrat Hasan ؓ held the post of Caliphate for about six months, and thereafter made a decision to hand the Caliphate totally over to Hadhrat Muâwiyah ؓ. This decision of Hadhrat Hasan ؓ shocked all, but through it the Ummah was re-united, the doors for Islâmic conquests reopened, the many evils that had, because of the in-fighting, crept into the Ummah,

were now pushed back, the Muslims power strengthened and the hopes of the hypocrites were shattered.

During his youth, Hadhrat Hasan ﷺ had received many indications from Rasulullâh ﷺ regarding the mantle that he would one day occupy. In the light of those indications, Hadhrat Hasan ﷺ took this most bold step, despite the opposition he encountered from those around him. The results of his bold decision soon proved that no better decision could have been made at that crucial time in Islâm. Rasulullâh ﷺ had himself indicated towards the wisdom and goodness behind this decision, when he had said, many years previously, from the pulpit, whilst pointing towards Hadhrat Hasan ﷺ:

ان ابني هذا سيد ولعل الله أن يصلح به بين فئتين من المسلمين عظيمتين (السنن الكبرى للنسائي)

This son of mine is a leader.
Perhaps Almighty Allâh shall use him to reconcile between two great parties of the Ummah!

The decision that Hadhrat Hasan ﷺ took to hand over the Caliphate was thus one hundred percent in accordance with the wish of Rasulullâh ﷺ. It was a decision that finally brought back for the Muslims their days of peace and unity. The only group that burnt upon seeing the results of this decision were the Khawârij/Persian satan-worshipping hypocrites, since this decision was going to halt their progress and spoil their plans for another twenty years plus.

As long as the term 'Love for the Ahle-Bait' suited their nefarious plans, these hypocrites would scream it out at the top of their voices. But, when the need for these illustrious personalities of the 'Ahle-Bait' would no longer remain, it would be these very hypocrites who would ensure their assassination. Who else was responsible for the assassination of Hadhrat Ali ﷺ? Were it not the very men who as long as they needed him, fought bravely in his defence and scream out

slogans in his honour, raising him from the level of being a slave of Almighty Allâh ﷻ to the mantle of divinity? Did the Khawârij, once upon a time, not form a major part of the army of Hadhrat Ali رضي الله عنه? Did they break away from him, merely on account of a misunderstanding, or was it due to many of their leaders being nothing but satan-worshipping hypocrites?

After the assassination of Hadhrat Ali رضي الله عنه, many of these hypocrites came running to pledge allegiance upon the blessed hands of Hadhrat Hasan رضي الله عنه. Their intention however was nothing but to re-ignite the extinguished flames of war, and start the fight for power all over again. Their slogans of "love for the Ahle-Bait'' once more began, and with it their hopes of collapsing the Islâmic Caliphate were raised again.

Six months later however, when the news of Hadhrat Hasan رضي الله عنه's decision reached their ears, they, in one second, forgot all their sympathy and love for the 'Ahle-Bait', and began openly mocking Hadhrat Hasan رضي الله عنه. For the second time this group was found giving support, hypocritically, merely in order to have their nefarious plans passed, and pulling back support, as soon as their need for the individual no longer remained.

Tabari has narrated that when Hadhrat Hasan رضي الله عنه was accepting the allegiance, he made the people say that they would obey his every command, would unite with whosoever he unites and fight against whosoever he fights. These conditions made the people of Irâq doubt his ability to rule. They began saying amongst themselves, 'This man is not fit for the job! It seems he is not interested in fighting! It was not long after that Hadhrat Hasan رضي الله عنه was stabbed (by some Irâqi warriors).

This attack made Hadhrat Hasanﷺ more wary and distant from the people of Irâq.[32]

Khateeb Al Baghdadi narrates in his Târikh that when the news of the decision of Hadhrat Hasanﷺ reached the ears of his die-hard supporters, it seemed as though their backs were going to break in anger. When Hadhrat Hasanﷺ came back, they even had the audacity to swear him in his face. A man, known as Abu Aamir, Saeed ibn Natl, mockingly addressed Hadhrat Hasanﷺ with the words:

السلام عليك يا مذل المؤمنين

Salaam be upon you, O the one who has disgraced the believers (Na'uuzubillah)

In Al-Bidayah it has been narrated that after handing over the Caliphate, Hadhrat Hasanﷺ, together with his entire family, left the lands of Irâq and returned to Madina Munawwara. As he would pass the different clans and tribes of Irâq, instead of crying and bidding him farewell, many would come out merely to rebuke him over his decision and cowardice.

Had these people really had any respect for him on the basis of his being from the Ahle-Bait, they would have respected his every decision, and would never have dared showing the least form of disrespect, especially when in front of him. The reality however was that there never was in the hearts of the Satanist hypocrites of

---

[32] حدثني عبد الله بن أحمد المروزي، قال: أخبرني أبي، قال: حدثنا سليمان، قال: حدثني عبد الله، عن يونس، عن الزهري، قال: بايع أهل العراق الحسن بن علي بالخلافة، فطفق يشترط عليهم الحسن: إنكم سامعون مطيعون، تسالمون من سالمت، وتحاربون من حاربت، فارتاب أهل العراق في أمرهم حين اشترط عليهم هذا الشرط، وقالوا: ما هذا لكم بصاحب، وما يريد هذا القتال؛ فلم يلبث الحسن رضي الله عنه بعد ما بايعوه إلا قليلاً حتى طعن طعنةً أشوته، فازداد لهم بغضاً، وازداد منهم ذعراً (تاريخ الطبري)

Irâq/Iran any love for the household of Nubuwwah. The term ‘love and revenge for the Ahle-Bait’ was merely a slogan they had devised to win support and sympathy. As long as any member of the Ahle-Bait was needed, they would reach the sky in praising and extolling him, but as soon as their motive was attained, they would disassociate from him completely, and in fact if needed, they would even be prepared to have him assassinated.

When one studies the reasons behind Hadhrat Hasan leaving Irâq for Madina-Munawwara, one shall find the prime reason being the abuse of the Irâqis towards him and his family, after he refused to submit to their demands of continuing the war against Hadhrat Muâwiyah. These people had no real interest in the spirituality and high rank of Hadhrat Ali, Hadhrat Hasan and Hadhrat Husain, and for all the other great personalities of the Ahle-Bait. Rather, the names of these luminaries were used merely to bait innocent believers into thinking that Imaan is based upon hating and fighting against all those, who, in their corrupted opinion, were opposed to the Ahle-Bait and had prevented them from their ‘divine’ right of rule, even if it may be the closest and most beloved companion of Rasulullâh, viz. Hadhrat Abu Bakr and his daughter, Hadhrat Ayesha.

Hadhrat Hasan himself explained the prime reason behind his abandoning Irâq. His words, as quoted by Tabari, were as follows:

يا أهل العراق إنه سخى بنفسى عنكم ثلاث قتلكم أبى وطعنكم إياى وانتهابكم متاعى (الطبري)

O people of Irâq! Three of your actions have spurred me to migrate from this land:

1) You assassinated my father!

2 You openly criticize and hurl remarks at me!

3) You looted my belongings!

The crux of the above is that Hadhrat Hasanؓ never left Irâq due to being 'defeated' by Hadhrat Muâwiyahؓ. His life did not end while he was burning with fury against Hadhrat Muâwiyahؓ and the people of Shâm. In fact, heؓ and his brother, Hadhrat Husainؓ, enjoyed many privileges during the reign of Muâwiyahؓ, and would at least once a year visit him in Shâm. Hadhrat Hasanؓ posed no threat to Hadhrat Muâwiyahؓ, thus it is impossible to believe that Hadhrat Muâwiyahؓ, after receiving a complete hand-over of power from Hadhrat Hasanؓ, would now find the need to have himؓ poisoned. The only ones that had a motive for assassinating Hadhrat Hasanؓ were the hypocrites of Irâq, who had been behind the assassination of Hadhrat Aliؓ, who had looted the belongings of Hadhrat Hasanؓ and stabbed him in the process, and who had turned completely against himؓ after his hand-over of power.

Those who were thirsty for the blood of the believers, and who had, from the very beginning, been behind all the turmoil reigning amongst the Muslims, who had been instigating one Muslim group against another, and who had forsaken Hadhrat Aliؓ and planned his assassination after finding him a barrier to their plans, these very people were now, after finding Hadhrat Hasanؓ not interested in continuing the war, looking for a new avenue of re-igniting the flames of disunity and turmoil within the Ummah.

As long as Hadhrat Hasanؓ would remain alive, there was no hope of any other opposition to Hadhrat Muâwiyahؓ standing up, thus the removal and assassination of Hadhrat Hasanؓ was imperative for the hypocrite/Satanist league operating from Irâq/Iran. Hadhrat Hasanؓ was poisoned, while in Madinah Munawwara, and an attempt was made to point the finger towards Hadhrat Muâwiyahؓ, an accusation that no sane mind would ever believe, and which no Sahâbiؓ ever gave any consideration to. The evil bodies behind hisؓ assassination

however remained hidden, as they had been in the assassination of Hadhrat Umarﷺ, Hadhrat Uthmaan, in the battles of Siffin and Jamal, in the assassination of Hadhrat Ali and in numerous other incidents.

As soon as Hadhrat Hasan was assassinated, this hidden satanic league turned its attention towards Hadhrat Husein, hoping that through him the fight for the caliphate would be re-ignited. Letters began pouring in, addressed to Hadhrat Husein, falsely attributed to the general population of Irâq, begging him to accept their allegiance and stand up against the so called 'oppressive' rule of Hadhrat Muâwiyah.

In Al-Bidâyah, Allâmah ibn Kathir narrates that after the death of Hadhrat Hasan, Musayyib ibn Utbah Al-Fazâri, together with a group of Irâqis, came to Hadhrat Husein and begged him to break his allegiance to Hadhrat Muâwiyah, and accept their allegiance to him, saying, 'We are well aware of your opinion in the matter regarding Muâwiyah, (referring to the fact that Hadhrat Husein was, from the very beginning not happy with the decision to hand over the caliphate).

Hadhrat Husein replied, 'I have hope that Almighty Allâh reward my brother for his good intentions (i.e. to refrain from fighting, and thus save the blood of the Ummah), and I hope that he rewards me for my good intentions (i.e. the love of fighting against the oppressors).[33]

When the governor of Madinah Munawwara, Marwan ibn Hakam received news of these delegations, he had a message sent to Hadhrat Muâwiyah, saying, "I fear that Husein shall become a target of Fitnah (turmoil)!" Hadhrat Muâwiyah thus wrote to Hadhrat

---

[33] قدم المسيب بن عتبة الفزاري في عدة معه إلى الحسين بعد وفاة الحسن، فدعوه إلى خلع معاوية وقالوا: قد علمنا رأيك ورأي أخيك، فقال: إني لارجو أن يعطى الله أخي على نيته في حبه الكف، وأن يعطيني على نيتي في حبي جهاد الظالمين (البداية)

Husein, cautioning him from falling into the trap of the Irâqis. His advice was as follows:

'Remember, the one who makes a pledge on the name of Allâh (i.e. has pledged allegiance to a Caliph), it is only appropriate that he now fulfils his pledge!" I have been informed that some people of Kufa have requested you to join them in breaking the unity. I am sure that through past experience you now realise that the people of Kufa can never be trusted. They have already betrayed your father and your brother. Thus, fear Almighty Allâh and remember your pledge. If you attempt to plot against me, I shall punish you severely!"

Hadhrat Husein replied to this letter, saying,

'Your letter has indeed reached me, and I am in no way intending to do that which you suspect. And Almighty Allâh alone guides towards good. I have no intention to fight against you, but at the same time I fear that if Almighty Allâh has to ask as to why I abandoned Jihad against you, I shall have no answer!'[34]

In Al-Akhbar Al-Tiwâl, Hafiz Dînawari has quoted the following[35], which explicitly shows that some people of Irâq were continuously on the

---

[34] وكتب مروان إلى معاوية: إني لست آمن أن يكون حسين مرصدا للفتنة، وأظن يومكم من حسين طويلا. فكتب معاوية إلى الحسين: إن من أعطى الله صفقة يمينه وعهده لجدير بالوفاء، وقد أنبئت أن قوما من أهل الكوفة قد دعوك إلى الشقاق، وأهل العراق من قد جربت قد أفسدوا على أبيك وأخيك، فاتق الله واذكر الميثاق، فإنك متى تكدني أكدك. فكتب إليه الحسين: أتاني كتابك وأنا بغير الذي بلغك عني جدير، والحسنات لا يهدي لها إلا الله، وما أردت لك محاربة ولا عليك خلافا، وما أظن لي عند الله عذرا في ترك جهادك (البداية)

[35] وبلغ أهل الكوفة وفاة الحسن، فاجتمع عظماؤهم فكتبوا إلى الحسين رضي الله عنه يعزونه. وكتب إليه جعدة بن هبيرة بن أبي وهب، وكان أمحضهم حبا ومودة: (أما بعد، فإن من قبلنا من شيعتك متطلعة أنفسهم

lookout for some excuse to reignite the flames of disunity amongst the believers:

'When the news of the death of Hadhrat Hasan ﷺ reached the people of Kufa, the leaders of Kufa sent their condolences to Hadhrat Husein ﷺ, via letters. Ja'dah ibn Hubeira, who would display the most love for the Ahle-Bait, wrote,

'Such friends of yours are present here (i.e. in Kufa and Irâq), who are eagerly awaiting your coming, who regard none as your equal! They are well aware that the opinion of your brother, Hasan, was to avoid war, whereas you are a man who shows kindness to friends and severity against the enemy, a man who fights bravely for the Deen of Allâh. Thus, if you are desirous of achieving these goals, come over to Kufa immediately, for we have, in your service, handed ourselves over to death!

Hadhrat Husain ﷺ answered as follows:

'I hope that Almighty Allâh blesses my brother with the best. As for me, at the present moment, I do not feel rebellion to be appropriate. Thus, as long as Muâwiyah remains alive, remain in Kufa, seek shelter in your homes, and avoid becoming targets of suspicion. If something happens to him (i.e. he passes away) whilst I am still alive, I shall write to you again, informing you of my plans.

إليك، لا يعدلون بك أحدا، وقد كانوا عرفوا رأي الحسن أخيك في دفع الحرب، وعرفوك باللين لأوليائك، والغلظة على أعدائك، والشدة في أمر الله، فإن كنت تحب أن تطلب هذا الأمر فاقدم علينا، فقد وطنا أنفسنا على الموت معك) فكتب إليهم: (أما أخي فأرجو أن يكون الله قد وفقه، وسدده فيما يأتي، وأما أنا فليس رأيي اليوم ذلك، فالصقوا رحمكم الله بالأرض، وأكمنوا في البيوت، واحترسوا من الظنة ما دام معاوية حيا، فان يحدث الله به حدثا وأنا حي، كتبت إليكم برأيي والسلام) (الاخبار الطوال للدينوري)

If one were to ponder over the above quotes, the reality shall surely dawn that certain elements in Irâq and its neighbouring surroundings were desperate to keep the Muslims disunited, and were clutching at every straw to achieve this. It is commonly understood that Hadhrat Huseinؓ went to Kufa due to the evil that Yazîd was perpetrating. The above and other evidence, that shall later be brought, shows that this was never the reason for Hadhrat Huseinؓ going over to Irâq. Rather, the call for rebellion against every ruling government was a common cry of evil elements of Irâq, Egypt, etc. They had made this cry during the rule of Hadhrat Uthmaanؓ, during the initial reign of Hadhrat Muâwiyahؓ, during the end of the rule of Muâwiyahؓ, when he appointed Yazîd as his successor, and during the era of Yazîd, when Hadhrat Huseinؓ finally accepted their invitation, but upon reaching Kufa, found none ready to stand in his support.

This call of rebellion against the Ummayyad government, would thereafter continuously be made, in different areas and at different times, with the basis now being 'revenge for the Ahle-Bait, revenge for Hadhrat Huseinؓ'. The efforts of these Satanist groups finally found some sort of success, about seventy years later, with the fall of the Ummayyad empire and the rise of the Abbâsi government, which was in actual fact, a Persian backed government, a government that opened up the doors for the Fâtimi/Satanist rule in Egypt, and brought into the Islâmic countries all corrupt ideologies and cults.

During the twenty-year reign of Hadhrat Muâwiyahؓ, Hadhrat Huseinؓ showed no interest in joining any rebellion, thus the efforts of the Irâqi hypocrites in reigniting the flames of unity during this period was minimal. The Muslims were now able to enjoy an era of peace, stability and have their eyes cooled by witnessing the doors of Jihâd against the disbelievers reopening. For some unknown reason, many still hold the notion that the rule of Hadhrat Muâwiyahؓ was an

oppressive, evil rule. To remove this misconception, a summary of the era of Hadhrat Muâwiyah, together with a brief introduction to the man himself, shall be given:

Hadhrat Muâwiyah and his era of rule

1) Hadhrat Muâwiyah was amongst those Sahâbah who took part in the battle of Hunain, regarding whom Almighty Allâh declared:

ثمَّ أنزلَ الله سَكينَتَهُ على رسولِه وعلى المؤمنين (التوبة – ٢٦)

'Then Allâh sent down His special mercies upon His messenger and upon the believers!'

2) Hadhrat Muâwiyah was amongst those Sahâbah who took part in the battle of Tabuk, regarding whom Almighty Allâh declared:

لَقَدْ تابَ اللّهُ عَلَى النَّبِيِّ والمُهاجِرينَ والأنْصارِ الَّذينَ اتَّبَعُوهُ في سَاعَةِ العُسْرَةِ

'Verily Almighty Allâh turned his attention of mercy upon His messenger, the Muhaajireen and the Ansaar, those who followed His messenger during the hour of difficulty (i.e. The Battle of Tabuk)'

3) Hadhrat Muâwiyah, besides being blessed with the mantle of Sahâbiyat, and being a close relative of Rasulullâh, was also blessed with the honour of being amongst the scribes of revelation.[36]

---

[36] وعن عبد الله بن عمرو بن العاص رضي الله عنهما قال: إن معاوية كان يكتبُ بين يَدَي رسولِ الله صلى الله عليه وسلم. رواه أبوعوانة والبزار والآجري من طريق الأعمش، عن عمرو بن مُرَّة، عن عبد الله بن الحارث، عن أبي كَثير الزُّبَيدي، عن عبد الله به.
قال الهيثمي في المجمع: "رواه الطبراني، وإسنادُه حسن

4) Qadhi Iyaadh has quoted that Muaaz ibn Imraan was once asked whether Muâwiyah ibn Sufyaanؓ was greater or Umar ibn Abdul Azizؓ. Hadhrat Muaaz became angry and retorted,

''A non-Sahâbi (i.e. Umar ibn Abdul Azizؓ or anyone else like him) can never be compared to a Sahâbiؓ!
(i.e. A non-Sahâbi can never reach the mantle and status of a Sahâbiؓ).
Hadhrat Muâwiyahؓ was a Sahâbi of Rasulullâhﷺ, his sister was the wife of Rasulullâhﷺ, he was the scribe of Rasulullâhﷺ, and one who Rasulullâhﷺ trusted with revelation."

5) When Abdullâh ibn Mubarak (the world-renowned scholar of hadith and fiqh, famous for his bravery, generosity, and deep knowledge in literature, nahw, *lughat*, poetry, and all other Islâmic branches) was asked as to who was greater, Umar ibn Abdul Aziz or Hadhrat Muâwiyahؓ, he issued such a reply which brought an end to the entire discussion. He said:

"The dust that settled on the nose of the horse of Muâwiyahؓ, whilst he rode alongside Rasulullâhﷺ,
that dust alone is a thousand times superior to Umar ibn Abdul Aziz!"

6) Hadhrat Muâwiyahؓ was blessed with the trait that his every judgement found success. One who will ponder slightly over his twenty-year rule, in which he pulled the entire Ummah out of years of in-fighting and united them under one flag, in which he sorted out the differences between all the disputing parties and brought stability back for the Ummah, in which he reopened the doors of Jihâd against the enemies of Islâm, and in which he

وقال شيخ الإسلام ابن تيمية في منهاج السنة "استَكْتَبَه النبي صلى الله عليه وسلم لخِبْرَتِه وأمانته

extinguished much of the fitnah(evil) that the Khawârij had ignited, if one were to ponder over these feats, achieved in such a short span, one shall surely admit that Hadhrat Muâwiyahؓ was indeed one of the greatest rulers the world had ever seen. If one were to ask as to where did Hadhrat Muâwiyahؓ learn such remarkable governing principles, the answer would be nothing else but that he had been blessed with the duas of Rasulullâhﷺ.

Abdur Rahman ibn Abi Umairahؓ has narrated that Rasulullâhﷺ made the following dua for Hadhrat Muâwiyahؓ:

اللهم اجعله هاديا مهديا واهد به (الترمذي)[37]

"O Allâh, make him a guide, guide him, and guide others through him!

The results of this most blessed dua were visible throughout the life of Hadhrat Muâwiyahؓ, and through the blessings of this dua he was able to establish such an empire, that made a senior member of the Tâbi'een, Al-A'mash, exclaim,

'If you had seen Muâwiyah, you would have thought him to be Al-Mahdi!'[38]

When the dua of Rasulullâhﷺ aided Hadhrat Muâwiyahؓ throughout his life, and drew him out safely from the most dangerous of situations, when it established him as 'one guided in his decisions', and as 'one, through whom others found guidance', when it enabled him to rule wisely as Amir over Shâm for twenty years, during the era of Hadhrat Umarؓ and Hadhrat Uthmaanؓ, and then for another twenty years as

---

[37] عن عبد الرحمن بن أبي عميرة وكان من أصحاب رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم عن النبي صلى الله عليه وسلم أنه قال لمعاوية اللهم اجعله هاديا مهديا واهد به قال أبو عيسى هذا حديث حسن غريب

[38] وعن الأعمش قال: لو رأيتم معاوية لقلتم: هذا المهدي. رواه الطبراني مرسلاً وفيه يحيى الحماني وهو ضعيف. (مجمع الزوائد)

Caliph over the entire Muslim world, could one ever then imagine that at the most crucial juncture of his live, i.e. at the time of his death, this most blessed dua would fail him, and instead of ending his life on the high note it had reached, he terminates it with the ‘worst’ decision a ruler could have ever made, i.e. appointing as a successor one who had absolutely no right and was not at all worthy of being appointed?

Those that view the decision of Hadhrat Muâwiyahرضي الله عنه in appointing his son as his successor, a decision upon which heرضي الله عنه remained upon during the last four years of his life, those that regard this decision to be the greatest administration error ever committed, should ponder over the dua of Rasulullâhﷺ for Hadhrat Muâwiyahرضي الله عنه, and ask themselves as to why did the dua fail when the time came for him to make the most crucial decision of his life!

Whosoever shall ponder over this point shall see in Hadhrat Muâwiyahرضي الله عنه and in his decision to appoint his son as his successor a completely different picture as to what Persian Satanists have portrayed to the world! (Insha-Allâh, at a later stage, this picture i.e. the true picture behind hisرضي الله عنه decision, shall be made more visible)

7) Tabrani has quoted an amazing experience of the Sahâbi, Hadhrat Auf ibn Malikرضي الله عنه. He narrates that while Hadhrat Aufرضي الله عنه was taking siesta, he awoke suddenly to find a lion approaching. He reached out for his sword, but the talking of the lion (by way of a miracle) caused him to stop in his tracks. The lion said, ‘Do not panic! I have been sent with a message! Allâh has sent me to order you to inform Muâwiyah that he is from the men of

Jannah!" Hadhrat Auf asked, 'Which Muâwiyah?' The lion replied, 'Muâwiyah ibn Abi Sufyaan!'[39]

8) Hadhrat Muâwiyah had the good-fortune of enjoying family relations with Rasulullâh. His relationship was first established due to both he and Rasulullâh being born in the family of Abde-Manaaf. This relationship was later strengthened when his sister, Hadhrat Umme-Habeebah, was married to Rasulullâh.

Imam Ahmad ibn Hanbal was once asked if the hadith, '*No family relation shall be of any aid on The Day of Judgement except that relationship which is linked to me*' also applies to Hadhrat Muâwiyah. Imam Ahmad replied, 'Most certainly! In fact he is linked to Rasulullâh both due to nasab (being from the same family) and due to him being the brother-in-law of Rasulullâh.[40]

Hadhrat Imam Ahmad ibn Hanbal would also say that due to Hadhrat Muâwiyah being the brother of Umme-Habeebah, who is one of the mothers of the believers, he shall thus take the title of being from amongst 'the uncles (mother's brother) of the believers.[41]

9) Rasulullâh praised the first Muslim army that shall wage jihâd by sea with the following words,

---

[39] وعن عوف بن مالك قال : كنت قائلا في كنيسة بأريحا وهو يومئذ مسجد يصلى فيه قال : فانتبه عوف بن مالك من نومته فإذا معه في البيت أسد يمشي إليه فقام فزعا إلى سلاحه فقال له الأسد : صه إنما أرسلت إليك برسالة لتبلغها قلت : من أرسلك ؟ قال : الله أرسلني إليك لتعلم معاوية الرحال أنه من أهل الجنة قلت : من معاوية ؟ قال : ابن أبي سفيان
رواه الطبراني وفيه أبو بكر بن أبي مريم وقد اختلط (مجمع الزوائد)

[40] روى الخلال في السنة واللالكائي عن عبد الملك بن عبد الحميد الميموني، قال: قلت لأحمد بن حنبل: أليس قال النبي صلى الله عليه وسلم: كلُّ صِهر ونسب ينقطع إلا صهري ونسبي؟ قال: بلى. قلت: وهذه لمعاوية؟ قال: نعم! له صهر ونسب

[41] قال الإمام أحمد: أقول: معاوية خال المؤمنين، وابن عمر خال المؤمنين. رواه الخلال في السنة بسند صحيح

أولُ جيشٍ من أُمَّتي يَغزون البحر قد أَوجَبوا (البخاري)

'The first army of my Ummah that shall ride the seas has made Jannah compulsory[42] for themselves'

Hadhrat Muâwiyahﷺ was blessed with the good-fortune of being the Amîr of this army.[43]This occurred during the rule of Hadhrat Uthmaanﷺ.

10) Rasulullâhﷺ had asked Almighty Allâh to overlook any such sentence that could emit from his blessed tongue, in which there might be some form of curse for an individual who was not deserving of it. If ever such a sentence would emit, Rasulullâhﷺ had asked Almighty Allâh to transform it into a means of purifying and elevating the individual.

Imam Muslim, in the chapter of those regarding whom Rasulullâhﷺ uttered some word which they were not deserving of, and which was then transformed into a dua for their spiritual and worldly elevation, made mention of an incident concerning Hadhrat Muâwiyahﷺ, which has been narrated from Hadhrat Abdullâh ibn Abbaasﷺ. The incident is as follows:

'Rasulullâhﷺ sent Abdullâh ibn Abbaasﷺ to call Muâwiyahﷺ. He returned, informing Rasulullâhﷺ that Muâwiyahﷺ was eating. After a while Rasulullâhﷺ again sent him and he returned with the same reply, i.e. that he is still eating. Rasulullâhﷺ, at that moment said, May Almighty Allâh never satiate his belly!' (Muslim)

Commenting on this, Allâmah ibn Kathir has written that Hadhrat Muâwiyahﷺ benefitted from this statement both in this world and the hereafter. His condition in this world was that his table would never be

---

[42] قال ابنُ حجر وغيرُه: معنى أَوجَبوا: أي فعلوا فِعلاً وَجَبَتْ لهم به الجنّة

[43] وقال الفِريابي: وكان أول من غزا يعني البحر معاويةُ في زمن عثمان بن عفان. (الشريعة للآجري) وعلى ذلك المؤرِّخون

empty. Food would continuously be brought in front of him, for him and his guests, and he would never find his belly unable to take in more. In fact, he himself would say, ‘My belly always has space for more. It is only that I get tired of eating!’[44]

11) Ibn Sa’d has narrated that once Hadhrat Muâwiyahؓ requested from Hadhrat Ayeshaؓ that she send to him the hair and shawl) of Rasulullâhﷺ. When it reached him he wore the shawl and after soaking the hair in water, drank the water, and passed it over his face.[45]

12) Despite Hadhrat Muâwiyahؓ being amongst those Sahâbahؓ who would only narrate from Rasulullâhؓ, after great thought and ensuring that he had heard and understood correctly, then too he was blessed with the honour of having, according to what has been counted, twenty three Sahâbahؓ narrating from himؓ, amongst whom were: Abu Zar Ghifariؓ, Abdullâh ibn Zubeirؓ, Abdullâh ibn Abbaasؓ, Abdullâh ibn Umarؓ, Abdullâh ibn Amr ibn al-Aasؓ, Nu’maan ibn Bashirؓ, Wa’il ibn Hujarؓ, Abu Dardaؓ, and Hadhrat Abu Saee’d Al-Khudriؓ..

Hafiz Ibn Hajar Al-Haithami has written, after making mention of the great luminaries from the Sahâbahؓ and Tâbi’een that had narrated from Hadhrat Muâwiyahؓ:

[44] وقال ابن كثير: "وقد انتفعَ معاويةُ بهذه الدعوة في دُنياه وأُخراه، أما فى دنياه فإنه لما صار إلى الشام أميراً كان يأكلُ في اليوم سبعَ مرات، يُجاء بقصعةٍ فيها لحمٌ كثير وبصلٌ فيأكل منها، ويأكل فى اليوم سبع أكلات بلحم، ومن الحلوى والفاكهة شيئا كثيرا، ويقول: (والله ما أشبع، وإنما أعيا)، وهذه نعمةٌ ومعدةٌ يرغبُ فيها كلُّ الملوك"

[45] روى ابن سعد ومن طريقه ابن عساكر عن مرجانة أم علقمة قالت: "قَدِمَ معاويةُ بن أبي سفيانَ المدينة، فأرسلَ إلى عائشةَ: أن أَرْسِلي إليَّ بأنبجانيّة رسولِ الله صلى الله عليه وسلم وشَعْرِه، فأَرْسَلَتْ به معي، حتى دخلْتُ به عليه، فأخذَ الأنبجانيةَ فَلَبسَها، وأخذَ شَعْرَه فدعا بماء فَغَسلَه، فشَرِبَه وأفاضَ على جِلْدِه".وسنده جيد

فتأملْ هؤلاء الأئمة أئمة الإسلام الذين رووا عنه؛ تَعلمْ أنه كان مجتهدا أيَّ مجتهد، وفقيها أيَّ فقيهٍ.

(تطهير الجنان)

'If you were to ponder over which giants of Islâm narrated from Hadhrat Muâwiyahؓ,
you shall realise what a great jurist and Mujtahid he was!

13) The fact that Hadhrat Muâwiyahؓ occupied the position of governor over Shâm during the reign of Hadhrat Umarؓ, that itself is sufficient as testimony of his high rank. Hadhrat Umarؓ had himself said:

"والله ما آلو أن أختار خياركم" (أبوعبيد في الأموال)

'By Allâh, I make every effort possible to choose only the best (as governor over the Muslims)

14) In praise of Hadhrat Muâwiyahؓ, Hadhrat Umarؓ said:

تَذكرونَ كِسْرَى وقَيْصَرَ ودَهاءَهُما؛ وعندكم معاوية"! (البلاذري بسند صحيح)

"You speak regarding the wit and intelligence of Kisrah and Caesar, whereas you have Muâwiyah amongst you!

15) In praise of Hadhrat Muâwiyahؓ, Hadhrat Abu Dardahؓ said:

ما رأيتُ أشْبَهَ صلاةً برسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم مِن أميركم هذا، يعني معاوية

(سير اعلام النبلاء)

'I have not seen one whose Salaah resembles the Salaah of Rasulullâhﷺ more than your Amîr, i.e. Muâwiyah!

16) Urwah ibn Zubeirؓ narrates that he never heard Miswar ibn Makhramahؓ making mention of Hadhrat Muâwiyahؓ, except that he would make dua for him.[46]

[46] قال عروة: فلم أسمَع المِسْوَر ذَكَرَ معاويةَ إلا صلّى عليه

17) Hadhrat Ayeshaرضي الله عنه was so happy with the rule of Hadhrat Muâwiyahرضي الله عنه, and the peace and stability he had established, that she would at times say:

إني لأتمنى أن يزيدَ اللهُ عزَّ وجلَّ معاويةَ مِن عُمري في عُمره.

(روى أبوعَرُوبة الحرَّاني في الطبقات بسند صحيح)

'At times I even wish that Almighty Allâh take from my lifespan and increase through it the lifespan of Muâwiyah.'

18) In praise of Hadhrat Muâwiyahرضي الله عنه, Hadhrat Abdullâh ibn Abbaasرضي الله عنه, who was known as the ocean of knowledge, said:

ليس أحدٌ منا أعلمَ من معاوية (رواه الشافعي في الأم بسند جيد)

'None of us have more knowledge than Muâwiyah!'

19) Hadhrat Abdullâh ibn Umarرضي الله عنه praised the generosity of Hadhrat Muâwiyahرضي الله عنه, saying that he had never seen a man more generous than him. When questioned as to whether he was even more generous than Hadhrat Umarرضي الله عنه himself, Ibn Umarرضي الله عنه replied that Hadhrat Umarرضي الله عنه was greater, but Hadhrat Muâwiyahرضي الله عنه was more generous.[47]

20) The great Sahâbi, who was placed in a fire but did not burn, Hadhrat Abu Muslim Khawlâniرضي الله عنه once said to Hadhrat Muâwiyahرضي الله عنه, 'By Allâh, from the time we began loving you, we have never harboured any anger towards you! From the time we began obeying you, we have never disobeyed you! From the time we united under you, we have never separated from you! From the time we pledged allegiance to you, we have never broken that allegiance! Our swords are on our necks. If you order, we shall obey! If you call, we shall immediately present

---

[47] وثبت من طرق عن عبد الله بن عمر رضي الله عنهما أنه قال: ما رأيت أحدا أسود من معاوية، قال الراوي: ولا عمر؟ قال: كان عمر خيرا منه، وكان معاوية أسود منه .قال الإمام أحمد: "معنى أسود: أي أسخى، وقال: السيّد: الحليم، والسيّد: المعطي، أعطى معاويةُ أهلَ المدينة عَطايا ما أعطاها خليفةٌ قد كان قبلَه"

ourselves! If you proceed ahead, we shall trail behind! If we proceed ahead, we shall always await your arrival![48]

21) Abu Ishaq As-Subei'ie said, 'After Muâwiyahﷺ, we found none that could match him!'[49] He would also say, 'If you had seen the era of Muâwiyahﷺ, you would have thought him to be the 'Promised Mahdi'![50]

22) Mujahid would say, 'Had you seen Muâwiyahﷺ, you would have said due to his great virtue that he is indeed "Al- Mahdi"![51] A similar statement has been attributed to Qatadah.[52]

Jihâd during the era of Hadhrat Muâwiyahﷺ

One of the salient features of the truthful Caliphs of Islâm was that they strove to keep Jihâd alive. In the era of turmoil, i.e. from the death of Hadhrat Uthmaanﷺ until the appointing of Hadhrat Muâwiyahﷺ as Caliph, this fundamental pillar of Islâm came to a temporary halt, which was just what the enemy desired. Then too, the desire to send out the Muslim armies to all the corners of the world, for the spreading of the truth, remained the burning desire of Hadhrat Aliﷺ, but due to circumstances he was unable to do so.

---

48 وقال أبومُسْلِم الخَوْلاني لمعاوية: فلا والله ما أبغضْناكَ منذ أَحببْناك، ولا عَصَيناك بعدما أَطَعْناك، ولا فارَقْناكَ بعدَما جامَعَنْاك، ولا نَكَثْنا بَيْعَتَنا منذُ بايَعْناك، سُيوفُنا على عَواتِقِنا، إنْ أَمَرْتَنا أَطَعْناك، وإنْ دَعَوْتَنا أَجَبْناك، وإنْ سَبَقْتَنا أَدْرَكْناك، وإنْ سَبَقْناكَ نَظَرْناك. رواه أحمد في مسائل ابنه صالح وفي الزهد، ومن طريقه ابن عساكر وابن العديم بسند شامي جيّد.

49 قال أبو إسحاق السبيعي الكوفي: كان معاوية، وما رأينا بعده مثله. (منهاج السنة بسند صحيح)

50 وقال حماد بن أسامة: حدثني الثقة عن أبي إسحاق أنه ذكر معاوية فقال: لو أدركتموه –أو: أدركتم زمانَهُ– كان المهدي. رواه الخلال في السنة ، وسنده صحيح إلى حمّاد، وهو مسلسل بالكوفيين

51 عن مجاهد قال: لو رأيتم معاوية لقُلْتم هذا المهدي من فضله. رواه الخلال في السنة وسنده صحيح

52 عن قتادة، قال: لو أصبحتم في مثل عَمَلِ معاوية لقال أكثركم: هذا المهدي. رواه أبوبكر الأثرم –ومن طريقه الخلال في السنة و سنده جيد

When Muâwiyahﷺ ascended, and the Muslims once again gathered under one flag, he immediately re-ignited the process of having armies continuously on the move.

Describing this virtue, Saeed ibn Abdul Aziz stated:

لما قُتل عثمان واختلف الناس لم تكن للناس غازية ولا صائفة حتى اجتمعت الأمة على معاوية سنة أربعين، وسمّوها سنة الجماعة. قال سعيد: فأغزا معاويةُ الصوائف وشتّاهم بأرض الروم؛ ست عشرة صائفة تصيفُ بها وتشتُو، ثم تَقفلُ وتدخلُ مُعَقِّبَتُها، ثم أغزاهم معاويةُ ابنَه يزيد في سنة ثنتين وخمسين في جماعة من أصحاب رسول الله في البر والبحر؛ حتى أجاز بهم الخليج، وقاتلوا أهل القسطنطينية على بابها، ثم قَفِل.رواه أبوزرعة في تاريخه ومن طريقه ابن عساكر بسند رجاله ثقات أثبات.

ورواه ابن عساكر أيضا عن سعيد بزيادة: "فلم يزل معاوية على ذلك حتى مضى لسبيله، وكان آخر ما وصّاهم به أن شُدّوا خناق الروم، فإنكم تَضبِطون بذلك غيرَهم من الأمم"

After the assassination of Hadhrat Uthmaanﷺ, the sending out of armies came to a halt, and was only re-initiated when the Ummah united on the appointment of Hadhrat Muâwiyahﷺ as Caliph, in the fortieth year after Hijri, which was called 'The Year of Unity'. Hadhrat Muâwiyahﷺ began sending armies into the Roman lands. A group of sixteen armies would spend the entire year there, and upon their return another group would take their place. Then, in the fifty-second year after Hijri, he appointed his son (Yazîd) as Amir over an army, which included many Sahâbahﷺ, (amongst whom were Hadhrat Abu Ayoob Ansaariﷺ and Hadhrat Huseinﷺ) to attack the Romans by land and by sea. This army finally managed to cross the gulf and lay an attack on Constantinople, from its very door step.
The army thereafter returned.

Had there been no other virtue to mention for Hadhrat Muâwiyahﷺ except this one, it would have been sufficient for his status to be realised, since the upholding of the fundamental of Jihâd has always been the hallmark of the truthful leaders of Islâm. Evil elements have

always tried to lay criticism on the rule of Hadhrat Muâwiyahرضي الله عنه and the Ummayyad Empire that he established, by citing incidents from the personal lives of some of its members, incidents which have no real sanad and can thus never be verified. The one aspect which they could not however manage to cover was the fact that Jihâd and Islâmic conquests thrived during its era, with its armies spreading out from Shâm in all directions.

It was during this era that:

- the first attack on Constantinople occurred, under the leadership of Yazîd
- Islâmic Armies reached islands of the Mediterranean Ocean
- Islâmic armies crossed the Atlantic and conquered Spain
- Conquests reached the southern tip of France
- The entire North Africa, practically, was brought under Muslim rule
- The lands known as 'ما وراء النهر', including Uzbekistan, Tajikistan, etc, was brought under Islâmic rule
- Muslim armies reached the borders of China, and collected Jizyah from its ruler
- Muslim armies brought India under Muslim rule

Due to the great conquests that occurred during this dynasty, some historians have stated:

لا غروَ اذ قيل انّ عصر بني امية من اهم عصور الفتوح في التاريخ الاسلامي (تاريخ العالم الاسلامي)

It would not be anything amazing if one were to say that the Ummayyad Empire
played one of the most important roles in Islâmic History, with regards to conquests made!

As for the dynasty that followed, known as the 'Banu Abbâs' which hailed from the lands of Irâq/Iran, this dynasty, despite opening wide its doors for all deviant groups, allowing the establishment of the first shia empire in Muslim lands, i.e. the Fatimid Empire, and bringing to a

practical halt all Islâmic Jihâd movements, despite delivering these and many other terrible blows to the Muslim world, yet one finds the books of history silent when it comes to criticizing it. Why? The reason is what has been mentioned from the beginning, i.e. jewish/satanic/hypocrite forces have always attacked the books of history, and endeavoured that the truth remain stained.

As for the oft-repeated narrations and historical incidents in which some form of criticism against Hadhrat Muâwiyah‎ﷺ and his family, the Banu Ummayyah, can be discerned, Allâmah Ibn Taimiyah, after proving in length that the Rawâfidh (Shia) have always emerged as the greatest liars and deceivers of every era, summarised the answers to all the objections raised against Hadhrat Muâwiyah and the Ummayyad Dynasty in the following words:

'The Shia rejects that which is clear-cut, and whose truth is evident. As for that which has no basis, and whose falsehood is manifest, those are the narrations which they strive to revive, an example of which is what they narrate regarding Hadhrat Muâwiyah. (Majmu-al-Fatawa)

When fabricated Ahâdith, condemning Hadhrat Muâwiyah, can be found with made-up-chains of narrators, what could one then expect to be the case with historical incidents, which have no chain of narrators whatsoever?

Sheikh Mahmood Shakir, while discussing the issue of Hadhrat Muâwiyah, his family, the Banu Ummayyah, and all its Caliphs, wrote most decisively:

"إن هذه الافتراءات على بني أمية ليس لها سند صحيح، ومعظمها مجهول المصدر، الأمر الذي يدل على كذبها، وبهذا لا يمكن الاعتماد عليها أبدا،

وإذا أخذنا بمنهج الحديث في الجرح والتعديل، وهو أفضل منهج للوصول إلى صحة الخبر، فإننا سنطرح هذه الروايات كلها التي تقوَّلت على بني أمية"

The accusations levelled against the Banu Ummayyah have no sound chains. In fact, in the majority of these narrations there is no mention of who first narrated it, which clearly indicates its being baseless. Thus, no consideration could ever be given to it. If one were to adopt here the method used for scrutinizing Ahâdith, which is of course the best method for ascertaining the truth of any manner, then majority, if not all, of the accusations levelled against the Banu Ummayyah shall be found unreliable and shall be disposed off.

A common accusation levelled against Hadhrat Muâwiyah from hypocrite quarters is that he had made many promises to Hadhrat Hasan and Hadhrat Husein to entice them to hand over the caliphate, but failed to fulfil those conditions afterwards. Anyone with a little knowledge of Islâmic history shall know that deception and lying were never the traits of the noble Arabs, neither before Islâm and of course not after.

Together with that, not a single incident can be found wherein Hadhrat Hasan or Hadhrat Husein stands up to complain to the people of Makkah Mukarramah or Madina Munawwara that Hadhrat Muâwiyah had deceived them and broken his promise. When the generosity of Hadhrat Muâwiyah would not miss the commoner, could one ever think that the noble grandsons of Rasulullâh would ever find him unwilling to give? Yes, if what they had asked was found out of his reach, due to promises and pacts which he could not break, then in those situations Hadhrat Muâwiyah would ensure that they be given a much better substitute.

Hadhrat Muâwiyah had a lot of respect for Hadhrat Hasan and Hadhrat Husein and would try his utmost best to fulfil their every request. This remained his trait throughout his life and he departed with this very bequest that their rank and status always be considered.

Hafiz Al-Deenawari has quoted the following in Akhbaar Al-Tiwaal:

"قالوا: ولم ير الحسن ولا الحسين طول حياة معاوية منه سوءا في أنفسهما ولا مكروها، ولا قطع عنهما شيئا مما كان شَرَط لهما، ولا تغيَّر لهما عن بِرّ

Historians have mentioned that throughout the life of Muâwiyahؓ, Hadhrat Hasanؓ and Hadhrat Huseinؓ never experienced any such act from him, which caused them inconvenience and difficulty, nor did they ever harbour any sort of anger and malice against him. Hadhrat Muâwiyahؓ ensured that they receive whatever had been promised to them, and he never withheld his favours and kindness from them.

Hadhrat Muâwiyahؓ in fact, performed the nikah of Hadhrat Hasanؓ to Ayesha, the daughter of Hadhrat Uthmaanؓ, and himself paid the mahr (dowry) of ten thousand dinaars on behalf of Hadhrat Hasanؓ. Ayesha thereafter remained in the marriage of Hadhrat Hasanؓ till his death.

Summary of the above

Hadhrat Muâwiyahؓ, together with being a close Sahâbi of Rasulullâhﷺ, which in itself is sufficient for one's praise, was blessed with many noble qualities and traits which made him an outstanding leader and a winner of hearts. His twenty year rule of peace and stability, which had been preceded by years of war and internal conflict, bear ample testimony to this.

If the purpose of mentioning all the above was merely to highlight the status of this great Sahâbiؓ, then despite this too being necessary in today's time and an act of great merit, but in the context of what we are trying to discuss, i.e. the reality behind Karbala, such a discussion would naturally seem out of line, especially since it has generally never been denied that he was a great man. The only problem seems to be with his son, Yazîd.

The actual purpose of the entire above discussion in actual fact has nothing to do with regards to the personality and status of Hadhrat Muâwiyahﷺ, but rather it has been brought to lay the foundation of a most important issue, which constitutes the basis of the investigation into the reality of Karbala.

In simpler words, whoever shall read about the conditions of peace and stability in the era of Hadhrat Muâwiyahﷺ, and shall study his noble traits and qualities, he shall be forced to admit that Hadhrat Muâwiyahﷺ left nothing during his reign of rule as a cause for any group to rise in rebellion. Yet if when one were to look a bit deeper, he would find the people of Kufa continuously calling for the overthrow of the government of Hadhrat Muâwiyahﷺ and the reinstating of the Ahle-Bait. What was Hadhrat Muâwiyahﷺ doing wrong that made them beg the Ahle-Bait to come over and have him overthrown? Was it that he too was committing adultery, or was he drinking liquor openly, or was he an oppressive, stone-hearted ruler?

The fact that the people of Irâq were continuously making attempts to incite Hadhrat Hasanﷺ and Hadhrat Huseinﷺ to rebel against Hadhrat Muâwiyahﷺ is no hidden matter. A few examples of their nefarious activities during the era of Hadhrat Muâwiyahﷺ have already been mentioned. But for the purpose of re-highlighting this fact, a narration of Mu'jam-e-Tabrani, which has a sound and strong chain of narrators, shall now be mentioned:

روى الطبراني في المعجم الكبير عن ابن عُيينة، عن عُبيد الله بن عبد الله بن الأصم، عن عمه يزيد بن الأصم، قال: خرجتُ مع الحسن (يعني ابن علي رضي الله عنهما) وجاريةٌ تَحُتُّ شيئا من الحِنَّاءِ عن أظفاره، فجاءتْهُ إِضْبارَةٌ من كُتُب، فقال: يا جاريةَ هاتي المِخْضَب، فصبَّ عليه ماءً، وألقى الكُتُب في الماء، فلم يفتح منها شيئا، ولم ينظر إليه، فقلتُ: يا أبا محمد! ممن هذه الكُتُب؟ قال: من أهل العراق، من قوم لا يرجعون إلى حقٍ، ولا يقصرون عن باطل، أما إني لستُ أخشاهم على نفسي، ولكني أخشاهم على ذلك. وأشار إلى الحسين. (وسنده جيد على شرط مسلم ، وقال الهيثمي في المجمع : ورجاله رجال الصحيح، غير عبد الله بن الحكم بن أبي زياد، وهو ثقة)

Yazîd ibn Al-Asam narrates that once whilst on a journey with Hadhrat Hasan ibn Aliﷺ, a bundle of letters reached him., Hadhrat Hasanﷺ

called for a container, and had water poured into it. He then threw the letters into the water, without even bothering to glance at its contents. I asked, 'O Abu Muhammad (Hadhrat Hasan), who has sent all of these letters?' He replied, 'It has come from the people of Irâq, a group that shall never accept the truth, and shall never desist from their evil! As for myself, I do not fear being deceived by these people. ***However I do fear that they may have an impact on him!' Saying this Hadhrat Hasan pointed towards Hadhrat Husein.****'*

When one questions as to the reason behind Hadhrat Husein going over to Irâq to assist with the overthrow of Yazîd, the answer shall generally be that Yazîd was a tyrant, an adulterer, a habitual drunkard, etc, (allegations that have never been proven).

But, if the same question is now put forward that these reasons are all well and valid, but what then was the reason behind the people of Irâq calling Hadhrat Hasan over, for the same sort of overthrowing during the reign of Hadhrat Muâwiyah. Was he too doing the same?

If this question can be answered, it shall open up an entirely new understanding of the incident of Karbala. Had the people of Irâq never complained of any governor before Yazîd, one could have possibly believed all their sorrowful tales of the cruelty of Yazîd, his oppression, his open transgression, etc. However, after realising that a group of people from Irâq were from the very beginning always at the throat of their leader, desiring his removal from his post, irrespective of his status; when one realises that overthrowing the government was always their goal and that they would do anything to accomplish it, one shall then look at the entire incident of Karbala and the accusations against Yazîd, preceded by the assassination of Hadhrat Hasan, from a different angle, and Insha-Allâh many unanswered questions shall then find answers.

The issues that shall Insha-Allâh be discussed are of an extremely delicate nature. It is like a bush of thorns, from which very few have come out unscathed. The majority who attempted falling into these issues were finally forced to take sides, some would side with Hadhrat Husein (which would obviously be the safer option), but would then have to answer as to why none of the Sahâba of Makkah Mukarramah and Madina Munawwara were prepared to join him in his journey to Irâq, and he would also have to explain why Hadhrat Muâwiyah, after ruling wisely for approximately twenty years, chose to make an unwise and rash decision to appoint his son who was (according to this group) not at all fit for the job, and thus put his hereafter in jeopardy.

As for the second group, who would side with Yazîd (which is clearly not a good decision at all), he would, besides having to face the wrath of the Ummah, have to answer as to why Yazîd made such a hasty decision in sending Ubeidullah ibn Ziyad over to Kufa to deal with Hadhrat Husein. When the matter was of such great importance, why did he himself not go over to Kufa and deal directly with the problem? And if it is said that Yazîd had never asked for the assassination of Hadhrat Husein, then why did he later not have Ubeidullah ibn Ziyad punished for not obeying his command? Also, why did he order an attack on the blessed cities of Makkah Mukarramah and Madinah Munawwara just before his passing away?

To attempt a thorough investigation into the matter of Karbala, with the purpose of making a decision in favour of one of the two groups, and finding the other blameworthy, such an attempt is not only futile and dangerous, but it is in fact fully in line with what the shayatâni forces had wanted from the very beginning. Taking sides has and shall achieve nothing except further weakening of the Ummah.

Fifteen noteworthy points

The safest route in this matter would thus be to look with an eye of justice and love at both parties, to regard both parties sincere in their motives, and to realise that love for any one party does not demand that the other not be defended. If one were to look at the matter of Karbala, after adopting this approach, fifteen startling points shall come to light, viz.

1) The call for the overthrowing of the Ummayyad Caliphate had nothing to do with Yazîd. Rather, this call had already been made in the era of Hadhrat Muâwiyah, and even in the era of Hadhrat Uthmaan. The practice of falsely accusing leaders and governors, merely to ensure no stability in the government, was thus nothing new.

2) The love of the Ahle-Bait, which the people of Irâq claimed to be the basis of their entire mission, was nothing but a shaytâni farce. This very slogan had already been used against Hadhrat Abu Bakr and Hadhrat Umar, with the claim that they snatched the right of Caliphate from Hadhrat Ali and deprived Hadhrat Fatimah from her inheriting a share in the land of Fidak. (Na'ûzubillah)

These very same hypocrites, who intended nothing but keeping the Ummah divided, then sided with Hadhrat Ali and at the same time continued instigating the opposing party, resulting in major wars breaking out amongst the Muslims, and many valuable lives being lost through in-fighting. In their hypocritical expression of love for the Ahle-Bait, they were even prepared to claim the divinity and infallibility of Hadhrat Ali, but as soon as he chose to halt the war, they forgot all their love and branded him apostate. Hadhrat Ali was thereafter assassinated by these very slogan-waving hypocrites, now known as the Khawârij, and Hadhrat Hasan was elected as the new leader.

The books of history record that the love the people of Irâq expressed for Hadhrat Hasan؄ was much more than the love they had once held for Hadhrat Ali؄, but this too was short-lived. As soon as Hadhrat Hasan؄ handed the reins of Caliphate over to Hadhrat Muâwiyah؄ his 'loyal' supporters suddenly disappeared. In fact, their attitude towards the illustrious grandson of Rasulullâhﷺ now became so filthy, that he finally felt it best to abandon the lands of Irâq and return to the pure lands of Hijaaz. The hypocrites of Irâq were so bold in their criticism of their once 'pure, infallible Imam', that they even had the audacity to walk right up to him and brand him as 'a disgrace to the Ummah'.

After reaching Madina Munawwara, the attempts of the hypocrites in luring Hadhrat Hasan؄ to break his pledge and call for the overthrow of Hadhrat Muâwiyah؄ continued, but Hadhrat Hasan؄ was no longer prepared to lend them an ear. The only fear he had was that their sad letters could have an effect on his brother, Hadhrat Husein؄, thus he always ensured that the letters be destroyed. There are even recorded incidents of Hadhrat Hasan؄ warning his brother against ever inclining towards the liars of Irâq.

3) As soon as Hadhrat Hasan؄ was assassinated, the slogans of love for the Ahle-Bait once again began pouring in from the people of Irâq, and regular invitations and appeals would be sent, begging that he take back the right of Caliphate, which (in their opinion) had been reserved for the Ahle-Bait, and promising their full support if he does so. Hadhrat Husein؄, understanding well that breaking one's allegiance without any real grounds was not allowed, would respond back that at the present moment they should remain patient, and let fate take its course.

The news that the people of Irâq were instigating Hadhrat Husein؄ to stand up against the government even reached the ears of Hadhrat Muâwiyah؄, upon which he sent a letter advising Hadhrat Husein؄

against any such act. Hadhrat Huseinؓ’s reply, as recorded in Al-Bidayah, and which has already been mentioned, was as follows:

‘Your letter has indeed reached me, and I am in no way intending to do that which you suspect. And Almighty Allâh alone guides towards good. I have no intention to fight against you, but at the same time I fear that if Almighty Allâh has to ask as to why I abandoned Jihad against you, I shall have no answer!’[53]

4) When Hadhrat Muâwiyahؓ decided upon selecting his son as the next Caliph, from the entire galaxy of the Sahâbahؓ and Tâbi’een, he found four or five senior Sahâbahؓ not in favour of his decision. From these, Hadhrat Abdullâh ibn Umarؓ and Hadhrat Abdullâh ibn Abbaasؓ, both promised that if they found the rest of the Ummah pledging allegiance to Yazîd, they would follow suit.

Hadhrat Muâwiyahؓ was now faced with the choice to either change his decision, due to the opposition of Hadhrat Huseinؓ, Hadhrat Abdullâh ibn Zubeirؓ and Hadhrat Abdur Rahmaan ibn Abu Bakrؓ, or ignore their opposition and move ahead with his intention. He chose the latter, since the selection of any other person would also not be free of the opposition of some party or the other. The people of Egypt would prefer Hadhrat Amr ibn Aasؓ, the people of Hijâz would prefer Hadhrat Abdullâh ibn Umarؓ or Hadhrat Abdullâh ibn Zubeirؓ, the people of Irâq would not be happy with anyone besides Hadhrat Huseinؓ, and the people of Shâm would never accept as their leader,

---

[53] **وكتب مروان إلى معاوية: إني لست آمن أن يكون حسين مرصدا للفتنة، وأظن يومكم من حسين طويلا. فكتب معاوية إلى الحسين: إن من أعطى الله صفقة يمينه وعهده لجدير بالوفاء، وقد أنبئت أن قوما من أهل الكوفة قد دعوك إلى الشقاق، وأهل العراق من قد جربت قد أفسدوا على أبيك وأخيك، فاتق الله واذكر الميثاق، فإنك متى تكدني أكدك. فكتب إليه الحسين: أتاني كتابك وأنا بغير الذي بلغك عني جدير، والحسنات لا يهدي لها إلا الله، وما أردت لك محاربة ولا عليك خلافا، وما أظن لي عند الله عذرا في ترك جهادك (البداية)**

except one from the tribe of the Ummayyad. Expecting all the clans and tribes to unanimously select one leader was thus a futile exercise and Hadhrat Muâwiyah رضي الله عنه was well aware of that.

It should also be remembered that when selecting the next Caliph, the present Caliph is encouraged to consult with his subjects, but not compelled to accept the decision. Hadhrat Abu Bakr رضي الله عنه himself ignored the opposition of certain people when it came to electing Hadhrat Umar رضي الله عنه as Caliph, and this has been the practice of every leader who came thereafter. Even in the electing of Hadhrat Uthmaan رضي الله عنه there existed a difference of opinion amongst the few who had been elected to choose, so how could it now ever be considered possible to find a man, upon whom the entire nation would agree.

5) When Hadhrat Husein رضي الله عنه and his companions were questioned as to the reason of their not agreeing with the decision of Hadhrat Muâwiyah رضي الله عنه, none of them made any mention that they found him unfit for the position, or that he was a habitual drunkard, or an adulterer, etc. Their answer was merely that they felt that this was opening up the door of '*Hirqaliyah* – a system of succession', where after every leader his son ascends the throne, irrespective of whether he is capable or not.

6) Hadhrat Muâwiyah رضي الله عنه was well aware of the reason behind their opposition, but still he felt that the betterment of the Ummah lay in Yazîd being elected. This decision of his was based purely on his sincere concern for the unity of the Ummah, and had nothing to do with desiring to keep power within his family.

7) The hypocrites of Irâq understood well that Hadhrat Husein رضي الله عنه was opposed to the appointment of Yazîd as Caliph, and found this to be the ideal opportunity to re-ignite the flames of war amongst the Ummah. Yazîd was in Shâm, far away from Irâq,

but as soon as the news of the death of his father began spreading, their letters of complaints against Yazîd began pouring in, whereas their leader was Hadhrat Nu'maan ibn Bashir, a Sahâbi, and Yazîd was far, far away from them.

8) The inhabitants of Makkah Mukarramah and Madinah Munawwara warned Hadhrat Husein from believing the letters of the people of Irâq, since their betrayal was well known, but he was determined to give them a final chance to prove their loyalty. He, due to the insistence of the people of Hijâz, eventually agreed to first send his cousin, Muslim ibn Aqeel over to Irâq, to confirm the authenticity of the letters from the people of Irâq. When Muslim ibn Aqeel arrived, he was introduced to scores of loyal supporters, and thus wrote to Hadhrat Husein that their support was genuine. As soon as the letter was sent, his host Mukhtaar ibn Ubeid Thaqafi had him exit his house, and Muslim ibn Aqeel found himself deserted, left at the mercy of Ubeidullah ibn Ziyaad. Before his death, he made a final attempt to warn Hadhrat Husein of the betrayal of the Irâqis, but his letter of warning reached too late.

9) Had there been no instigators and hypocrites acting as in-betweens, Hadhrat Husein and Yazîd would have surely come to a truce, but fate had been written otherwise. Ubeidullah ibn Ziyaad was never going to allow Hadhrat Husein the opportunity to speak personally to Yazîd, knowing full well that Yazîd would surely pardon him, as was the bequest of his father.

10) Hadhrat Husein had been invited over to Irâq, not to lead any revolution, but rather so that his life could be used as an excuse to start a revolution that was intended to bring down the entire Ummayyad empire. The hypocrites who had written to him,

inviting him and promising their help, were never going to be interested in saving his life. Rather, it was nothing but his blood that they desired, which they could thereafter use as a support-gainer against the Ummayyad, who would be framed for the killing. Why else do you think that from the hundreds that showed their faces to Muslim ibn Aqeel, as loyal supporters of Hadhrat Husein﵁, not a single one of them showed up when he required their help the most. In fact, as mentioned in many narrations, **it was these very hypocrites who stood on the side of the army who had come out in his opposition.**

11) There was no reason to have Hadhrat Husein﵁ martyred. He himself offered to allow himself to be arrested and taken to Yazîd. In fact, he even promised, as mentioned in narrations, that he was now prepared to pledge allegiance at the hands of Yazîd. Such a move would have surely be a strengthening factor to the rule of Yazîd, thus it is inconceivable that Yazîd would have ever disagreed to such a proposal. The only benefactors from the martyrdom of Hadhrat Husein﵁ were the very hypocrites who had lured him into coming to Irâq. His blood was essential to their plans. To ensure that he does not come out alive they even joined the army coming out to have him arrested. The purpose of these hypocrites in the army of Ubeidullah ibn Ziyaad was merely to ensure that Hadhrat Husein﵁ does not leave Karbala alive.

12) There is no proof that Yazîd ever ordered the killing of Hadhrat Husein﵁ and common sense itself shall show that even the most weak-minded of rulers would avoid issuing such an order. Historical narrations clearly show Yazîd openly expressing his innocence from having issued such a command, and wishing if only such a disaster could have been averted. Almighty Allâh

Himself exposed the culprit behind the death of Hadhrat Husein, i.e. Ubeidullah ibn Ziyaad, by having snakes come out from his nostrils and ears after his death, as quoted by Imam Tirmidhi, whereas no such thing happened with Yazîd.

13) A few years after the martyrdom of Hadhrat Husein, the first host of Muslim ibn Aqeel, Mukhtaar ibn Ubeid Thaqafi, openly made the call of rebellion against the Ummayyad, using the slogan of 'revenge for the Ahle-Bait' as a source of winning support. With such a slogan, who would ever think of not lending a helping hand to his movement? The sorrowful tales of Karbala had already made the public lose faith in the Ummayyads, and all were thus desirous of justice being served.

The revolution led by Mukhtaar gained tremendous support and soon the majority of Irâq was rallying under his flag. As his power increased, he made apparent a few of his satanic beliefs, first claiming that Mohammad Hanafiya, the son of Hadhrat Ali, was the promised 'Mahdi', and thereafter moving to the claim that he himself was 'God-incarnated' (Na'ûzubillah). His soldiers behaved as barbarians as they raped and savaged innocent women and children, and massacred all who resisted joining their movement.

His move was finally brought to an abrupt end when Hadhrat Abdullâh ibn Zubeir ordered his brother, Mus'ab, to stop him in his tracks. A fierce war broke out and Mukhtaar was finally brought to the ground. When this was the reality of the first host of Muslim ibn Aqeel, what else could then be said of the entire affair of calling Hadhrat Husein over to Irâq except that it was nothing but a bloody conspiracy, plotted by shaytâni forces spread along the length and breadth of the Islâmic world, with its centre being Kufa?

14) Just as how Yazîd had been instigated into sending Ubeidullah ibn Ziyaad against Hadhrat Husein رضي الله عنه, so too was he later instigated into having his forces attack the holy lands of Makkah Mukarramah and Madinah Munawwara. Yazîd could possibly never be found completely innocent of having made rash decisions, but accusations of kufr, fisq, etc, that, without any real proof, is surely not the demand of looking at the matter with the eyes of justice.

15) The martyrdom of Hadhrat Husein رضي الله عنه was surely one of the major catastrophes that the Ummah had to see, but it was definitely not the worst. Why then has it remained the only episode that gets remembered year after year, and why has an open investigation into its reality never been allowed?

Why has every party that has attempted to question the affair of Karbala been branded as ‘men against the Ahle-Bait’? Is it that the label ‘against the Ahle-Bait’ has been formed to ensure that none ever dare investigate the ‘bloody’ secrets behind Karbala, and to serve a purpose similar to that which ‘the holocaust’ and ‘911’ serve, i.e. to keep the flames of war blazing, to rally support for a mission engulfed in false accusations and oppression, and to ensure that the truth never gets revealed.

The above fifteen points have been mentioned as a summary of what one could discover if the incident of Karbala were to be studied without any preconceived idea in mind. It is not necessary that one’s conclusion be exactly the same, but the minimum that an unbiased study of the incident would do is leave one with many unanswered questions, and with many doubts regarding the story that has become common amongst the masses and even amongst many scholars.

As with regards to proving the above fifteen points, let if first be understood that most of what is known regarding Karbala and the factors leading to it has been derived from historical narrations, which can never be accepted as concrete proof. These historical narrations either have no chain of transmission (sanad) and even if they do, very few have undergone any sort of test to verify its authenticity. Added to this is the fact that even if a narration can be traced up to a Sahâbi, through a strong chain of narrators, then too, the question shall always remain as to who did the Sahâbi get his information from. A Sahâbi would never lie, but in the era of the Sahâbah and Tâbi'een, hypocrisy was indeed rife, and liars, instigating Sahâbah and Tâbi'een against each other, were spread around the Muslim world.

If a statement of a Sahâbi or a senior Tabi'ee had to reach us with an accepted chain, it would still be necessary to search for the informant before accepting the information. If the Sahâbi or Tabi'ee were to claim that he had witnessed an incident personally, his word would be taken immediately, but if he was merely quoting what had reached him, such news would require verification.

Incidents of men like Abdullâh ibn Saba' and others instigating Sahâbah and Tâbi'een against each other are numerous, and in fact it was this very sort of instigation that laid the foundation for the assassination of Hadhrat Uthmaan, and the wars that followed thereafter. Thus, if a Sahâbi or Tabi'ee were to comment on any issue regarding the conflicts that occurred during their era, it would be essential that before accepting his statement, it first be seen if his informant can be relied on, and whether the informant himself witnessed the incident personally, or is he also merely narrating from someone else. At times, one shall realise that despite an incident being narrated by numerous historians, but when it comes to tracing it to at

least one authentic source, not a single narration can be found to be reliable.

Historical narrations lending support to the version that has been mentioned above can thus easily be provided, but narrations supporting conflicting versions can just as easily be found. What shall the criterion therefore be, which shall prompt one to accept one narration over another, when in strength each narration is practically the same, i.e. its authenticity can hardly be verified?

In proving the fifteen points mentioned above, I have thus chosen a method of questioning the motive, wisdom, probability and practicality of different aspects regarding Karbala and surrounding issues. That version which fits most with the demands of Islâmic principles, and does not leave unanswered questions shall be adopted, and all conflicting narrations ignored. Historical narrations supporting the preferred version shall be provided, not to prove the version, but rather merely to show that such narrations also exist, which have generally been ignored, either purposely, or just because it was felt that is goes against the grain of the commonly accepted version.

Karbala and its surrounding issues, facts or fiction

1) The assassination of Hadhrat Hasan رضي الله عنه and the culprits behind it

Various parties have been accused of poisoning Hadhrat Hasan رضي الله عنه, with the most famous being that it was his wife, Ja'dah bint Ash'ath,

instigated either by Hadhrat Muâwiyah﵁, with the promise of marrying her to his son, Yazîd, or instigated by her own father, Ash'ath ibn Qais, who in turn was instigated by Hadhrat Muâwiyah﵁. Despite this view being mentioned in many unverified historical narrations, the accusation against Ja'dah and Hadhrat Muâwiyah﵁ fails to answer the following questions:

a) What benefit could Hadhrat Muâwiyah﵁ ever derive from the assassination of Hadhrat Hasan﵁? In fact, as long as Hadhrat Hasan﵁ remained alive, there remained no fear of the Irâqis instigating Hadhrat Husein﵁, since it was common knowledge that Hadhrat Hasan﵁ was totally against in-fighting, and for that very reason had agreed to hand over the Caliphate. Had Hadhrat Hasan﵁ been alive at the time when Hadhrat Muâwiyah﵁ decided to elect his son, Yazîd, as the next Caliph, there is a great possibility that he would have ensured that none oppose Hadhrat Muâwiyah﵁, since his life ambition was to keep the unity of the Ummah, and to seal all doors that could lead to in-fighting.

In attempting to answer this, certain narrations have been concocted to show that in the truce made between Hadhrat Muâwiyah﵁ and Hadhrat Hasan﵁ it was agreed that after the death of Hadhrat Muâwiyah﵁ the caliphate would be returned to Hadhrat Hasan﵁. Hadhrat Muâwiyah﵁'s motive in having him﵁ assassinated was thus to protect himself from having to fulfil this condition. (Na'ûzubillah) The stupidity and absurdness of this 'made up motive' is more than evident, since if such a condition had ever been laid, it would have been common knowledge amongst all the Sahâbah﵁ and Tâbi'een present during that era, and it would surely have found some mention in authentic narrations.

b) Why can no narration be found wherein Hadhrat Husein ﷺ accuses Hadhrat Muâwiyah ﷺ of having killed his brother? Rather, what can be found is that even after the death of Hadhrat Hasan ﷺ, Hadhrat Husein ﷺ would continue visiting Hadhrat Muâwiyah ﷺ at least once a year, and accepting from him gifts, just as he would do during the lifetime of his brother.

c) The wife of Hadhrat Hasan ﷺ, Ja'dah, was herself a princess, being the daughter of Ash'ath ibn Qais, chief of the famous and mighty tribe of Kindah, and loyal friend of Hadhrat Ali ﷺ. She had the honour of being in the marriage of the prince of both the worlds, the most handsome man of the time, the grandson and beloved of Rasulullâh ﷺ, a man who every woman of that time desired entering into his wedlock, even if only for a short while. Due to being the wife of Hadhrat Hasan ﷺ, she was also blessed to be the daughter-in-law of Hadhrat Fatima Zahra ﷺ, and of the close household of Rasulullâh ﷺ Having acquired all this prestige and honour, what benefit could there now possibly be for her to forfeit all this glory and honour, merely so that she could be married to Yazîd, who was absolutely no match whatsoever in front of the leader of the youth of Jannah, Hadhrat Hasan ﷺ!

d) Had Hadhrat Muâwiyah ﷺ or Yazîd ever thought of poisoning Hadhrat Hasan ﷺ, they would never have done it through his wife. Would they ever take the chance of having themselves humiliated in front of the entire Ummah, and branded as traitors, knowing full well that a wife's love for her husband, especially a husband like that of Hadhrat Hasan ﷺ, would surely have her expose their evil intentions? When no weak-minded man would ever take such a chance, where then could such an

unwise plot ever emit from the mind of Hadhrat Muâwiyah﵁, who has been declared as one of the most wise of the Arabs.

e) If the motive behind the assassination of Hadhrat Hasan﵁ was to clear the path for his son, Yazîd, to become Caliph, why then did Hadhrat Muâwiyah﵁ also not make some sort of effort to have the few standing in opposition to Yazîd's election also murdered. Hadhrat Muâwiyah﵁ was well aware that the only true opposition that Yazîd would have to face was that of Hadhrat Husein﵁ and Hadhrat Abdullâh ibn Zubeir﵁. If assassinating Hadhrat Hasan was so easy, why did he then not have the same done with these illustrious two as well?

f) Hadhrat Hasan﵁ would yearly present himself, together with his brother, in front of Hadhrat Muâwiyah﵁. Had Hadhrat Muâwiyah﵁ ever intended having him assassinated, he could have easily ordered that they be ambushed during one of their journeys and killed. In this way, there would be no fear of a woman ever exposing the men behind the killing, nor any concern of Hadhrat Husein﵁ later standing up in retaliation.

g) According to one narration, the father of Ja'dah, i.e. Ash'ath ibn Qais, having been bought off by Hadhrat Muâwiyah﵁, instigated his daughter to poison Hadhrat Hasan﵁. From all the narrations, this one is the most preposterous, since Ash'ath ibn Qais passed away approximately nine years before the demise of Hadhrat Hasan﵁, and according to some narrations, Hadhrat Hasan﵁ himself performed his janaazah.

Due to the above eight factors (a-g) it seems only right that Hadhrat Muâwiyah﵁, Yazîd, and Ja'dah bint Ash'ath be absolved from having played any role in the assassination of Hadhrat Hasan﵁, and other suspects now be brought under investigation. The suspects with the

greatest motive, who would attain the most benefit through the death of Hadhrat Hasanؓ would obviously be none other than the very ones who had been behind all the wars and assassinations thus far, i.e. the Satanist/persian /Khawârij/jewish forces operating primarily from Irâq, but whose forces of hypocrites had now spread all over the Muslim world.

Their motive would be obvious, i.e. only with the removal of Hadhrat Hasanؓ could their hopes of re-igniting the flames of war ever be realised. Hadhrat Hasanؓ had already made it clear that he was never going to lend support to any Irâqi movement, and as long as he was alive, he would ensure that Hadhrat Huseinؓ also never inclines towards them.

A narration, with a sound and strong chain, which supports this has already passed[54], in which Hadhrat Hasanؓ expressed concern that in his absence he feared that the people of Irâq would easily instigate his brother against the present government and thus re-ignite the flames of war amongst the Ummah.

Another indicating factor towards the involvement of this group is the fact that as soon as the news of the death of Hadhrat Hasanؓ spread, letters from parties in Irâq began pouring in, expressing regret over his death, but at the same time instigating Hadhrat Huseinؓ to join them

---

[54] *Yazid ibn Al-Asam narrates that once whilst on a journey with Hadhrat Hasan ibn Aliؓ, a bundle of letters reached him., Hadhrat Hasanؓ called for a container, and had water poured into it. He then threw the letters into the water, without even bothering to glance at its contents. I asked, 'O Abu Muhammad (Hadhrat Hasanؓ), who has sent all of these letters?' He replied, 'It has come from the people of Irâq, a group that shall never accept the truth, and shall never desist from their evil! As for myself, I do not fear being deceived by these people. However I do fear that they may have an impact on him!' Saying this Hadhrat Hasanؓ pointed towards Hadhrat Huseinؓ.' (Majmauz Zawaid)*

in opposing the government. An example of this has also previously passed, the gist of which is as follows:

(When the news of the death of Hadhrat Hasanرضي الله عنه reached the people of Kufa, the leaders of Kufa sent their condolences to Hadhrat Huseinرضي الله عنه, via letters. Ja'dah ibn Hubeira, who would display the most love for the Ahle-Bait, wrote,

'Such friends of yours are present here (i.e. in Kufa and Irâq), who are eagerly awaiting your coming, who regard none as your equal! They are well aware that the opinion of your brother, Hasan, was to avoid war, whereas you are a man who shows kindness to friends and severity against the enemy, a man who fights bravely for the Deen of Allâh. Thus, if you are desirous of achieving these goals, come over to Kufa immediately, for we have, in your service, handed ourselves over to death!)

As for Hadhrat Muâwiyahرضي الله عنه, no real change in his manner of governing occurred after the death of Hadhrat Hasanرضي الله عنه, which could in some way have indicated that he was just waiting for the death of Hadhrat Hasanرضي الله عنه to carry out some new idea. It was only seven years later, when he felt that his death was fast approaching, that he began considering having Yazîd elected as Caliph after him. Hadhrat Hasanرضي الله عنه passed away in the 49nt year after Hijrah, whilst the issue of having Yazîd elected only began in the 56th year after Hijrah, four years before the death of Hadhrat Muâwiyahرضي الله عنه.

The crux of this discussion is that the accusation made against Hadhrat Muâwiyahرضي الله عنه and Yazîd regarding their involvement in the murder of Hadhrat Hasanرضي الله عنه, this accusation has no real basis, and common logic also defies it. In fact, during the entire era of Hadhrat Muâwiyah, not a word was ever mentioned regarding his, or his son's possible involvement in the death of Hadhrat Hasanرضي الله عنه. Hadhrat Huseinرضي الله عنه, for

the next nine years, continued making his annual visits to Hadhrat Muâwiyahؓ, but not once did he even raise the issue of the death of his brother.

It was only years later that evil segments had this absurd claim propagated, and without any verification, simple-minded believers began repeating it, as though it was a decided truth. As for those against whom there definitely was some form of case, i.e. the liars of Irâq, their mention was hardly ever made in the lists of possible suspects.

As with regards to the woman accused of poisoning Hadhrat Hasanؓ, Ja'dah bint Ash'ath, despite famous historians having painted her as the killer, without making any indication whatsoever that this accusation too has never been verified, if one were to merely ponder over her life-history alone, it would be more than sufficient to expose the fact that the accusation laid against her, forget not being proven, was never even mentioned during her lifetime.

A summary of her life, as taken from Tabaqât Ibn Sa'd, and other sources, show:

1) She was the maternal niece of Hadhrat Abu Bakrؓ.

2) She was married to Hadhrat Hasanؓ, while Hadhrat Aliؓ, was alive. She thus had the privilege of remaining in the wedlock of Hadhrat Hasanؓ for over nine years, getting separated only due to hisؓ death. Hadhrat Hasanؓ was well known for his habit of retaining women in his marriage for only short periods of time, and thereafter divorcing them and accepting others into his wedlock, merely with the intention of allowing more and more woman the opportunity of having some sort of share to be from the

family of Rasulullâh ﷺ. Despite this habit, Hadhrat Hasan رضي الله عنه kept Ja'dah till the end. Why?

Can it be conceived that a man of such wisdom and foresight remain blinded from the evil hidden within this woman, thereby keeping her back and sending away so many other righteous and pious women? Does the love and inclination which Hadhrat Hasan رضي الله عنه expressed for this woman not offer any indication towards her nobility, piety, righteousness and sincerity? Has Quraan not hinted that the inclination, love and admiration expressed by a pure believing male for his female partner should be considered as a significant sign of the purity of the female herself?[55]

3) After the death of Hadhrat Hasan رضي الله عنه, Ya'qub ibn Talha, the son of Hadhrat Talhah ibn Zubeir رضي الله عنه (one of the ten who received glad-tidings of Jannah during their life) extended his hand of marriage towards her. She remained with him in Madinah Munawwara, till his death and bore him three

---

[55] Reference is being made to the verse 26 of Surah An Nur, wherein Almighty Allah states:

- وَالطَّيِّبَاتُ لِلطَّيِّبِينَ وَالطَّيِّبُونَ لِلطَّيِّبَاتِ'

'And pure souls shall surely only be inclined to that which is pure'.

This verse was revealed in relation to the incident of Ifk, wherein Hadhrat Ayesha رضي الله عنها was accused of adultery (Na'ûzubillah). In explaining the various reasons why the believers should never have laid an ear to the accusation, Almighty Allah here explained that the fact that Rasulullah', who was the purest of pure, reserved the most love and inclination for Hadhrat Ayesha رضي الله عنها, that itself should have been sufficient to expose the lie in this erroneous claim.

{ والخبيثون } أيضاً { للخبيثات } لأن المجانسة من دواعي الانضمام { والطيبات } منهن { لِلطَّيِّبِينَ } منهم { والطيبون } أيضاً { للطيبات } منهن بحيث لا يتجاوزونهن إلى من عداهن وحيث كان رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم أطيب الأطيبين وخيرة الأولين والآخرين تبين كون الصديقة رضي الله تعالى عنها من أطيب الطيبات بالضرورة واتضح بطلان ماق يل فيها من الخرافات حسبما نطق به قوله سبحانه : { أُوْلَئِكَ مُبَرَّءونَ مِمَّا يَقُولُونَ } (روح المعاني)

children. Ya'qub ibn Talha was a high-ranking Tabi'ee, famous for his generosity. Would such a man ever think of marrying a woman who had been accused of poisoning Hadhrat Hasanؓ, and thereafter residing with her in the very city in which Hadhrat Hasanؓ had passed away?

4) During her stay in Madinah Munawwara, with her new husband, a time came when the people of Madinah, including her husband, pledged their allegiance to Hadhrat Abdullâh ibn Zubeirؓ. During this time, why did Hadhrat Abdullâh ibn Zubeirؓ not have her brought to trial? The only reason that comes to mind is that during that time, in Madinah Munawwara, not a single accusation had been levelled against her by anyone, thus the need of an investigation never arose.

5) After the death of Ya'qub, the eldest son of Hadhrat Abdullâh ibn Abbaasؓ married her, from whom she bore two children. Knowing the close relationship between Hadhrat Abdullâh ibn Abbaasؓ and the family of Hadhrat Aliؓ, could one ever imagine his eldest son marrying a woman accused of poisoning Hadhrat Hasanؓ. The fact that he married her and kept her with him in Shâm clearly shows that during that era no accusation had been levelled against her, neither in Hijâz, nor in Shâm.

From the above, one can clearly gauge that during the era of the Sahâbahؓ, no accusation has ever been made against Hadhrat Muâwiyahؓ, nor against Yazîd, and neither against Ja'dah, at least not in the lands of Hijâz and Shâm. No trial was ever held, no evidence was ever heard, and in fact no finger was ever pointed at any one of these three, regarding having played any role in the death of Hadhrat Hasanؓ. When this is the case, could one ever now dare lifting a finger

of accusation against any of these individuals, especially after being aware of the strict verdict of the Shariah regarding accusing without any valid proof!

2) Why did Hadhrat Muâwiyah appoint his son, Yazîd, as Caliph after him?

Was it due to extreme love he held for his son, which spurred him to betray the trust the Ummah had placed upon him, and appoint one unworthy as their leader. (Na'ûzubillah) Or was it that his love for fame and power would not allow him to let the reigns of Caliphate ever leave his family? (Na'ûzubillah)

After a period of over forty years, during which Hadhrat Muâwiyah proved himself as a great well-wisher of the Ummah, and displayed, through his actions, the acceptance of the dua of Rasulullâh for him, that he always be righty-guided, now when his death was most evident, and when his hereafter was about to begin, would such an intelligent man ever make a decision that would wash away all his good, just so that his son gets the title of 'Caliph'? (Na'ûzubillah)

If all the above are to be regarded as impossible, what then could ever have been the reason behind Hadhrat Muâwiyah being so insistent that the Ummah accept Yazîd as their Caliph, despite knowing full well that certain illustrious Sahâbah were not at all happy with his intention?

Perhaps one could say that Hadhrat Muâwiyah was unaware at that time regarding the future actions of his son, and understanding him worthy had him appointed. The problems with this answer however are manifold, a few of which are:

a) It is clear from the books of history that Hadhrat Muâwiyah was well informed of the dissatisfaction of

certain Sahâbah, with regards to his making Yazîd Caliph. In fact, Hadhrat Muâwiyah even travelled to Hijâz, solely to discuss this issue with them and question the reason behind their disapproval.

b) After the death of Hadhrat Muâwiyah, not a single Sahâbi, from those who had shown their dissatisfaction with his decision, ever mentioned to the people that the reason behind their not pledging to Yazîd was due to his actions changing drastically after the death of his father.

c) From the five Sahâbah who openly criticized the decision of Hadhrat Muâwiyah while he was alive, only two remained standing in opposition after the appointment of Yazîd, i.e. Hadhrat Abdullâh ibn Zubeir and Hadhrat Husein. Hadhrat Abdur Rahmaan ibn Abi Bakr passed away before this, whilst Hadhrat Abdullâh ibn Umar and Hadhrat Abdullâh ibn Abbaas, as they had previously promised, pledged allegiance.

If one were to say that Yazîd was good while his father was alive, and his true colours were only revealed upon the death of his father, then one would surely have to question the wisdom behind Hadhrat Abdullâh ibn Umar and Hadhrat Abdullâh ibn Abbaas opposing Yazîd's appointment, while he was outwardly pious and upright (i.e. during his father's life) and accepting his rule happily, after he began displaying all his evil colours and traits (i.e. after the death of his father). It would be as though one is saying that they openly rejected his appointment while he was good, and happily accepted it when he became bad! (Na'ûzubillah)

d) If Yazîd did really become bad and evil after the death of his father, why then did the vast majority of Sahâbah and Tâbi'een not oppose him? Rather, the books of history show clearly many illustrious Sahâbah and Tâbi'een serving happily as commanders, chiefs, advisers, etc, under Yazîd.

Could it ever be possible that after having seen only upright, Allâh-fearing caliphs, viz. Hadhrat Abu Bakrؓ, Hadhrat Umarؓ, Hadhrat Uthmaanؓ, Hadhrat Aliؓ, Hadhrat Hasanؓ, and Hadhrat Muâwiyahؓ, the Ummah would then suddenly find their new Caliph, Yazîd, perpetrating open acts of indecency and immorality, yet none from his chief ministers, advisers, soldiers, and the Ulema and Fuqeha around him would criticize his actions, or at least announce his resignation from Yazîd's cabinet?

The above few points shall Insha-Allâh be sufficient to show the weakness of the view that Hadhrat Muâwiyahؓ appointed Yazîd as Caliph while he was good, and that the opposition of Hadhrat Huseinؓ occurred only due to his later turning evil.

The question now remains as to why would Hadhrat Muâwiyahؓ, right at the end of his life, choose to spoil his hereafter by entrusting the responsibility of caliphate over to his son, knowing full well that there were many other more deserving candidates, and that his son, Yazîd, was not at all fit for the job? What could possibly have spurred him on to make such a rash decision and why did the general Ummah, which comprised of many Sahâbahؓ, during the four years that he remained alive after openly announcing his decision, not demand that he retract? If one were to reply that five senior Sahâbahؓ did in fact object, the question shall then be phrased more explicitly as, 'why did only five from the entire galaxy of Sahâbahؓ and Tâbi'een object? Why did the rest remain silent? Could it be conceived that all the Sahâbahؓ and Tâbi'een of that era, besides five, had now become so gripped with the fear of the Muâwiyah regime that none dared speak out?

If one were to then answer that during that era there were not really so many senior Sahâbahؓ alive, our answer would be that in the matters of Din, the junior Sahâbahؓ, and Tâbi'een were blessed with the very fervour which the seniors had been blessed with. Where the seniors were lamps of guidance, so too were the juniors!

In fact, a mere glance at the names of the illustrious Sahâbah رضي الله عنه alive during that era would be more than sufficient to show the weakness behind this argument. For the benefit of the masses, some of these names shall be listed below. Amongst these names, some shall be of those, who although they never lived to see the reign of Yazîd, but were however alive when Hadhrat Muâwiyah رضي الله عنه announced his decision to have his son appointed as Caliph after his death, yet they voiced no opposition to his decision.

In Al-Bidayah it has been recorded that the announcement of Yazîd becoming Caliph after Hadhrat Muâwiyah رضي الله عنه, this was made in the 56th year after Hijrah, four years before the demise of Hadhrat Muâwiyah رضي الله عنه. Sahâbah رضي الله عنه and senior Tâbi'een, who lived after the announcement, but did not voice any objection, include, amongst others:

1) Hadhrat Ayesha رضي الله عنه, (passed away 58 A.H) whose opinion in all Deeni matters was respected greatly by all, and whose objection against Yazîd being appointed would most definitely have been recorded, had she ever made any. In fact, when Hadhrat Muâwiyah رضي الله عنه complained to her رضي الله عنه, regarding the few Sahâbah رضي الله عنه who were in objection to his decision of appointing Yazîd, she رضي الله عنه advised him to treat them with forbearance, and ensured him that what he desired, that would surely happen. [56]
2) Hadhrat Umme Salamah رضي الله عنه (59 A.H)
3) Hadhrat Abdullâh ibn Amr ibn Aas رضي الله عنه (63 A.H)
4) Hadhrat Dhahaak ibn Qais رضي الله عنه (64 A.H) He served under Hadhrat Muâwiyah رضي الله عنه, <u>then under Yazîd</u>, then under Muâwiyah ibn Yazîd, and finally when Muâwiyah ibn Yazîd

---

[56] ثم دخل على عائشة، وقد بلغها أنه ذكر الحسين وأصحابه، فقال: لأقتلنهم إن لم يبايعوا، فشكاهم إليها، فوعظته وقالت له: بلغني أنك تتهددهم بالقتل، فقال: يا أم المؤمنين هم أعز من ذلك ولكني بايعت ليزيد وبايعه غيرهم، أفترين أن أنقض بيعة قد تمت؟ قالت: فارفق بهم فإنهم يصيرون إلى ما تحب إن شاء الله. قال: أفعل (الكامل)

stepped down from the caliphate, he pledged allegiance to Hadhrat Abdullâh ibn Zubeirرضي الله عنه.

5) Hadhrat Jaabir ibn Samuraرضي الله عنه (66 A.H)
6) Hadhrat Adi' ibn Haatimرضي الله عنه (67 A.H)
7) Hadhrat Bashir ibn Aqrabah Al-Juhaniرضي الله عنه
8) Hadhrat Mahmud ibn Rabi' (99 A.H)
9) Hadhrat Bureida Aslamiرضي الله عنه (73 A.H)
10) Hadhrat Bilial ibn Harith Muzaniرضي الله عنه (60 A.H) He carried the flags of Muzeinah on the Day of the Conquest of Makkah Mukarramah.
11) Hadhrat Aa'iz ibn Amr (Abu Hubeira)رضي الله عنه (passed away in the caliphate of Yazîd) – He was from the Sahâbah who made the pledge of Al-Ridwan.
12) Hadhrat Abdullâh ibn Abi Aufaرضي الله عنه (86 A.H)
13) Hadhrat Abu Juheifahرضي الله عنه (83 A.H)
14) Hadhrat Amr ibn Hirriethرضي الله عنه (85 A.H)
15) Hadhrat Abdullâh ibn Busr Maaziniرضي الله عنه (88 A.H)
16) Hadhrat Abu Umamah Baahiliرضي الله عنه (86 A.H)
17) Hadhrat Anas ibn Mâlikرضي الله عنه (93 A.H)
18) Hadhrat Wathila ibn Asqa'رضي الله عنه (85 A.H)
19) Hadhrat Abdullâh ibn Hadith Zubeidiرضي الله عنه (86 A.H)
20) Hadhrat Hirmaas ibn Ziyaad Baahiliرضي الله عنه (102 A.H)
21) Hadhrat Ruweiqi' ibn Thabit Ansaariرضي الله عنه (63 A.H)
22) Hadhrat Salamah ibn Akwaرضي الله عنه (74 A.H)
23) Hadhrat Bureida ibn Huseibرضي الله عنه (73 A.H)
24) Hadhrat Abu Baraza Aslami (74 A.H)
25) Hadhrat Abdullâh ibn Mugaffalرضي الله عنه (59 A.H)
26) Hadhrat Abu Waqid Laithiرضي الله عنه (68 A.H)
27) Hadhrat Jaabir ibn Abdullâhرضي الله عنه (74 A.H)
28) Hadhrat Abdullâh ibn Tha'labahرضي الله عنه (93 A.H)
29) Hadhrat Abdullâh ibn Ja'farرضي الله عنه (84 A.H)
30) Hadhrat Miswar ibn Makhramahرضي الله عنه (64 A.H)
31) Hadhrat Maslamah ibn Makhladرضي الله عنه (62 A.H)
32) Hadhrat Abu Tufeil, Aamir ibn Wathilahرضي الله عنه (100 A.H)

33) Hadhrat As'ad ibn Sahl ibn Haneef ﷺ (100 A.H)

In short there were many Sahâbah ﷺ who were alive at the time when Hadhrat Muâwiyah ﷺ announced his decision to appoint his son after him, yet none of them voiced any objection. Neither have any objections, in the lifetime of Hadhrat Muâwiyah ﷺ, against Yazîd from the senior Tâbi'een been recorded. Could it be that all were afraid of Hadhrat Muâwiyah ﷺ, or was there some other reason for their silence?

An explanation that, in my understanding, answers the issue of why Hadhrat Muâwiyah ﷺ chose to appoint his son, Yazîd, despite being aware that five senior Sahâbah ﷺ were opposing the idea, and answers why practically all the Sahâbah ﷺ and Tâbi'een accepted Yazîd as Caliph, shall now be mentioned. If one chooses not to accept this explanation, he should then search for another, but one that does not put any stain on the integrity of the Sahâbah ﷺ as a whole, and on Hadhrat Muâwiyah ﷺ in particular.

An explanation that clears these illustrious personalities from all accusations and doubts

When Hadhrat Muâwiyah ﷺ passed the age of seventy, after enjoying twenty years of stable rule as Caliph, his attention and worry shifted to ensuring that the Ummah do not, after his death, again fall into years of in-fighting, due to their differences with regards to who should be the next Caliph.

Hadhrat Muâwiyah ﷺ's base had always been the land of Shâm, with his capital in Damascus. The army of Shâm had always proven loyal to his command, even during the most trying of times. Hadhrat Muâwiyah ﷺ understood well that the warriors of Shâm had a strong affiliation with the Ummayyad clan, due to Hadhrat Muâwiyah's

lengthy rule over them, first as governor, from the time of Umarرضي الله عنه, and thereafter as Caliph. The fear always existed that by now selecting a Caliph from another clan, it could re-ignite the fights and bloodshed that the Ummah had just come out off.

This feeling of Hadhrat Muâwiyahرضي الله عنه was indeed dead on target, and found its proof years later when Hadhrat Abdullâh ibn Zubeirرضي الله عنه was selected as Caliph by the inhabitants of Hijâz, but due to his not being from the Ummayyad clan, he did not receive the full support of the people of Shâm. In fact, they were even prepared to make an assault upon the noble cities of Hijâz, just so that an Ummayyad could receive the seat of caliphate. Hadhrat Abdullâh ibn Zubeirرضي الله عنه was finally martyred and an Ummayyad, Marwan ibn Hakam, followed by his son, Abdul Malik ibn Marwan was placed on the seat of caliphate.

Hadhrat Muâwiyahرضي الله عنه's ardent desire was that the flames of fire amongst the Muslims never be re-ignited by the hypocrites of Irâq. He thus searched for a solution that would keep all happy and the flags of Jihâd in full motion. For this, he consulted his senior advisors and spent many months in deep thought. Finally, his eye fell upon his son, Yazîd, who had already proven himself as an able leader, after leading the first attack on Constantinople, over an army which consisted of many senior Sahâbahرضي الله عنهم, with Hadhrat Abu Ayoob Ansaari being the most note-worthy, due to his passing away on this journey.

Hadhrat Muâwiyahرضي الله عنه found his armies of Shâm as loyal and obedient to Yazîd as they were to him. Had he immediately chosen Yazîd as Caliph after him, he would hardly have found any opposition from those around him, and his decision would then have become binding upon the rest of the Ummah. Hadhrat Muâwiyahرضي الله عنه however felt it best to make his intention known and to see what the Ummah felt regarding it.

From the very beginning, Hadhrat Muâwiyahﷺ made it clear that the appointment of his son had nothing to do with holding on to power. It was based solely on the well-being of the entire Ummah, and to keep the unity. Statements recorded from Hadhrat Muâwiyahﷺ, regarding this, are as follows:

إني خفت أن أذر الرعية من بعدي كالغنم المطيرة ليس لها راع (البداية)

***I** fear leaving the Ummah after me as a scattered flock with no shepherd!*

Hadhrat Muâwiyahﷺ presented this reason to Hadhrat Abdullâh ibn Umarﷺ, upon which Ibn Umarﷺ promised that if the Ummah would pledge allegiance to Yazîd, he too would do the same, and this was exactly what heﷺ did after the death of Hadhrat Muâwiyahﷺ.

وروينا عن معاوية أنه قال يوما في خطبته: اللهم إن كنت تعلم أني وليته لانه فيما أراه أهل لذلك فأتمم له ما وليته، و إن كنت وليته لاني أحبه فلا تتمم له ما وليته (البداية)

(It has been narrated that Hadhrat Muâwiyahﷺ mentioned once, while on the pulpit)
O Allâh, if I had appointed him (Yazîd) on account of finding him able and suitable for the post, then let it happen!
And if I had appointed him, solely out of my love for him, then let it not happen!

إني أرهب أن أدع أمة محمد كالضأن لا راعي لها (الطبري)

I fear leaving the Ummah of Rasulullâhﷺ as sheep with no shepherd!

إني قد كبرت سني، ودق عظمي، وخشيت الاختلاف على الأمة بعدي،
وقد رأيت أن أتخير لهم من يقوم بعدي،
وكرهت أن أقطع أمراً دون مشورة من عندك، فاعرض ذلك عليهم وأعلمني بالذي يردون عليك (الكامل)

(When the thought of appointing Yazîd as Caliph first occurred to Hadhrat Muâwiyahﷺ,
heﷺ sent the following command to his governors)

I have reached old age, and my bones are now weak and lean. I fear that the Ummah may divide and differ after my death, thus I have chosen to appoint a Caliph who shall rule after me. However, I dislike doing any such thing, except after mutual consultation. Thus, inform the people of my intention, and inform me regarding their opinions in this matter!

History can never deny that after the intention of Hadhrat Muâwiyah رضي الله عنه was made known, the vast majority accepted his decision happily, and many even expressed joy over the fact that a suitable leader has been chosen, and that future internal fighting has been avoided. To throw water over this reality, hypocrite elements worked tirelessly to pollute these narrations with their poison, and today unfortunately we find narrations suggesting that all the noble and influential men and women of that era, besides three[57], were bought off and bribed by Hadhrat Muâwiyah رضي الله عنه into accepting Yazîd as their leader. (Na'ûzubillah)

Some speeches made in front of Hadhrat Muâwiyah رضي الله عنه, by delegations of various Muslim countries, with regards to his intention of appointing Yazîd, shall now be mentioned. However, as previously mentioned, if one were to open the books of history, he shall find just before the narration a few sentences, fabricated by hypocrite forces, indicating that the speaker had been bought off, and was thus acting hypocritically. (Na'ûzubillah!)

a) According to some narrations, the first individual to suggest appointing Yazîd as Caliph was Hadhrat Mughîra ibn Shu'bah رضي الله عنه. In presenting the reason behind his suggestion, he explained:

[57] Initially five had voiced their opposition, but two, viz. Hadhrat Abdullah ibn Umar رضي الله عنه and Hadhrat Abdullah ibn Abbas رضي الله عنه made it known from the beginning that they would accept Yazid, if the rest of the Ummah did.

يا أمير المؤمنين قد رأيت ما كان من سفك الدماء والاختلاف بعد عثمان، وفي يزيد منك خلف، فاعقد له فإن حدث بك حادثٌ كان كهفاً للناس وخلفاً منك ولا تسفك دماء ولا تكون فتنة (الكامل)

O Amirul-Mu'mineen, verily you had seen the spilling of blood and disunity that occurred after the assassination of Uthmaan. In Yazîd there is a worthy successor, thus appoint him as the next leader, so that if something has to happen to you, the people may find protection in him, and a leader to take over from you, and the need to spill blood and cause chaos shall not arise!

b) A delegation of approximately forty people from Irâq, with Urwah ibn Mughîra (the son of Hadhrat Mughîra ibn Shu'bah), delivered the following address:

يا أمير المؤمنين كبرت سنك وخفنا انتشار الحبل فانصب لنا علماً وحد لنا حداً ننتهي إليه. فقال: أشيروا علي. فقالوا: نشير بيزيد ابن أمير المؤمنين. فقال: أوقد رضيتموه؟ قالوا: نعم. قال: وذلك رأيكم؟ قالوا: نعم، ورأي من وراءنا

O Amirul-Mu'mineen, now that you have become old we fear disunity once again raising its filthy head, thus choose for us a leader, to who we may all turn! When asked who they felt suitable, they replied, 'Your son, Yazîd! That is our opinion and the opinion of those behind us!'

c) Dhahaak ibn Qais Al-Fihr (a prominent Sahâbi) delivered the following address:

يا أمير المؤمنين إنه لابد للناس من والٍ بعدك، وقد بلونا الجماعة والألفة فوجدناهما أحقن للدماء، وأصلح للدهماء، وآمن للسبل، وخيراً في العاقبة، والأيام عوج رواجع، والله كل يوم في شأن، ويزيد ابن أمير المؤمنين في حسن هديه وقصد سيرته على ما علمت، وهو من أفضلنا علماً وحلماً، وأبعدنا رأياً، فوله عهدك واجعله لنا علماً بعدك ومفزعاً نلجأ إليه ونسكن في ظله

O Amirul-Mu'mineen! It is essential that the people have a leader after you. We have found that in unity alone is the protection of our blood, and it alone shall keep peace and harmony amongst us. Times are always changing and Almighty Allâh alone is unique. As you are well aware, Yazîd, your son, is a man of good character and firm determination. He is most forbearing, knowledgeable and far-sighted.

Thus appoint him as leader after you, so that we may live in harmony under his shadow!

It should be well understood that I am not trying to show that none opposed the decision to have Yazîd appointed, as that would be an open lie. What I am trying to show is that those that happily accepted the decision were indeed many; and to say that their accepting was based solely on worldly motives, greed, etc, is preposterous and an unsupported accusation.

The books of history itself accept the fact that the vast majority of the Ummah promised to pledge their allegiance to Yazîd, in the case of the demise of Hadhrat Muâwiyahؓ, a majority which consisted of many illustrious Sahâbahؓ and Tâbi'een. And from those that opposed, history itself shows that Hadhrat Abdullâh ibn Abbaasؓ and Hadhrat Abdullâh ibn Umarؓ later pledged their allegiance, just as they had initially promised. Were they all bought off?

Unable to veil this reality, the most that the hypocrites could do was to forge some excuse of why the vast majority of the Ummah happily accepted the decision of Yazîd's appointment as the next Caliph. One such excuse that found a stable place in the books of history is what has been quoted by Ibn Athir in Al-Kamil:

وكان معاوية يعطي المقارب ويداري المباعد ويلطف به حتى استوثق له أكثر الناس وبايعه

Muâwiyahؓ would shower favours upon those close to him, and show his compassion and kindness to those who wished to remain aloof, until finally majority of the Ummah accepted his decision and pledged their allegiance to Yazîd.

The excuse mentioned above, despite it being the most suppressed in attacking the honour of the illustrious personalities of that era, yet when one scrutinizes it slightly, he shall find it boiling down to one statement, i.e. Hadhrat Muâwiyahؓ bought their allegiance! (Na'ûzubillah! – Neither was Hadhrat Muâwiyahؓ a briber, nor was the Ummah as a whole ever a sell-out!)

The fact of the matter is that there is no other reason for the vast majority of the Ummah accepting Yazîd, except that they had no real problem with him being their leader, just as how they had no problem when he led the first expedition to Constantinople, despite there being senior Sahâbah alive at that time, who in fact participated in that very expedition.

The only question that now arises is that if there was nothing really wrong with Yazîd, then why did Hadhrat Abdullâh ibn Zubeir, Hadhrat Abdullâh ibn Umar, Hadhrat Abdullâh ibn Abbaas, Hadhrat Husein and Hadhrat Abdur Rahmaan ibn Abu Bakr openly oppose the decision?

The opposition of a few illustrious Sahâbah to the appointment of Yazîd and the reason behind it

Generally it has been understood that these Sahâbah opposed the decision due to Yazîd being a drunkard, an adulterer, an open transgressor, etc. Had any of these factors been present in Yazîd, during his illustrious father's life, do you think Hadhrat Muâwiyah would ever have appointed him as the next Caliph? Forget caliphate, Hadhrat Muâwiyah would never have even made him a governor or collector over any area. Rather, Hadhrat Muâwiyah would have immediately established the Islâmic punishment upon him, and had he not done so, the rest of the Ummah would surely have stood up and demanded that his son be tried for his crimes and filthy acts.

Had any of these factors been present in Yazîd, do you think Hadhrat Muâwiyah would have made a special trip to Hijâz, just to enquire the reason behind the opposition of these illustrious men? And when he did finally get the opportunity to question them with regards to their opposing his decision, would not at least one of them have made mention of any one of these factors? In the answers that these

illustrious Sahâbahؓ presented to Hadhrat Muâwiyahؓ, there is no mention of Yazîd being a transgressor, an adulterer, a drunkard, etc. In fact, had any of them or anyone else ever accused Yazîd of adultery, the accuser would immediately have been asked to present four witnesses, failing which, he himself would have been whipped eighty times for false accusation. Did any such thing happen?

When Hadhrat Muâwiyahؓ questioned the reason behind their opposition, their answer was solely that they feared that by him appointing his son as Caliph, an act which none had done thus far, it would open up the doors for *hirqaliyah* in the matters of caliphate, i.e. upon the death of a Caliph, the eldest son would automatically take the throne, even if he had no credentials, no ability, and no interest whatsoever.

According to a narration of Ibn Athir in Al-Kamil, when the first news of Yazîd's appointment reached the people of Hijâz, Hadhrat Abdur Rahmaan ibn Abu Bakrؓ openly announced his displeasure in the following words:

ولكنكم تريدون أن تجعلوها هرقلية كلما مات هرقل قام هرقل

Rather, it is your intention to establish the caliphate on the principles of herculism,
i.e. upon the death of one leader; his son shall immediately take his place!

When Hadhrat Abdullâh ibn Zubeirؓ spoke on behalf of all, the point that he put forward to Hadhrat Muâwiyahؓ was that he should adopt the method of either Hadhrat Rasulullâhؓ, who left the matter of appointing a new Caliph in the hands of the Ummah, or of Hadhrat Abu Bakrؓ, who appointed a man out of his family circle, viz. Hadhrat Umarؓ, or of Hadhrat Umarؓ, who ordered that the next Caliph be chosen from a group, after mutual consultation of the members of that particular group. Hadhrat Abdullâh ibn Zubeirؓ's purpose was to highlight the point that before Hadhrat Muâwiyahؓ, none had ever

chosen a Caliph from within his own family, and thus they felt that he should follow suit.

The discussion between Hadhrat Muâwiyahؓ and Hadhrat Abdullâh ibn Zubeirؓ, as recorded in Al-Kamil, was as follows:

'Choose one of three options. Either adopt the method of Rasulullâhﷺ, or that of Abu Bakrؓ, or that of Umarؓ. The method of Rasulullâhﷺ was that heﷺ did not appoint any vicegerent, and the Ummah thereafter unanimously chose Abu Bakrؓ as their leader.' Hadhrat Muâwiyah replied, 'At present, there is no man like Abu Bakrؓ, upon whom all shall unite, thus I fear disunity arising.'

Hadhrat Abdullâh ibn Zubeirؓ thereupon said, 'Fair enough, so why do you not adopt the method of Abu Bakrؓ, who did appoint a man from the Qureish, but who was not of his immediate family, or the method of Umarؓ, who left the matter for six to decide, but ensured that his sons and immediate family did not feature amongst those six![58]

The options presented by Hadhrat Abdullâh ibn Zubeirؓ to Hadhrat Muâwiyahؓ makes it very clear that the opposition of these illustrious individuals had nothing to do with the personality of Yazîd himself, but rather with the fact that he was the son of the Caliph. They had no problem with Hadhrat Muâwiyahؓ selecting a future Caliph, nor did they have any problem with Yazîd. They were only in opposition to the act of a Caliph selecting some close family member as the next Caliph.

---

[58] نخيرك بين ثلاث خصال. قال: اعرضهن. قال: تصنع كما صنع رسول الله، صلى الله عليه وسلم، أو كما صنع أبو بكر أو كما صنع عمر. قال معاوية: ما صنعوا؟ قال: قبض رسول الله، صلى الله عليه وسلم، ولم يستخلف أحداً فارتضى الناس أبا بكر. قال: ليس فيكم مثل أبي بكر وأخاف الاختلاف. قالوا: صدقت فاصنع كما صنع أبو بكر فإنه عهد إلى رجل من قاصية قريش ليس من بني أبيه فاستخلفه، وإن شئت فاصنع كما صنع عمر، جعل الأمر شورى في ستة نفر ليس فيهم أحد من ولده ولا من بني أبيه (الكامل)

In clearer words, had Hadhrat Muâwiyah﵁ selected someone out of his immediate family circle, they would have no objection. Also, if some other Caliph had to later choose Yazîd, that too would be acceptable, as long as there existed no close family link between the two. The issue was with selecting close family members, and had nothing whatsoever to do with the personality of Yazîd!

This, and this alone is the reason why none of them criticized the character of Yazîd when voicing their opposition, and why none of them felt the need to attack the integrity, ability, etc. of Yazîd. Understand this well, for upon this lies the basis for understanding the truth behind the incident of Karbala, and it is this point that shall explain why both parties, i.e. Hadhrat Husein﵁ and Yazîd, later did what they did.

Hadhrat Muâwiyah﵁ heard and understood the reason behind their opposing his decision, but as every Amîr has the option to either consider or reject the opinion of even influential members of his cabinet; Hadhrat Muâwiyah﵁ too had that right. Hadhrat Muâwiyah﵁ weighed his options and finally decided to go ahead with his proposed intention, knowing full well that some or the other party would always stand in opposition, no matter who would be elected.

The people of Shâm had their own likes and dislikes, the people of Irâq were never found happy with anyone thus far, the people of Hijâz would obviously desire one from the Banu Hashim, whereas the people of Damascus would not accept except one from the Ummayyad family. Choosing one whom all unanimously accepted, that was now close to impossible, thus Hadhrat Muâwiyah﵁ felt that the safest for the Ummah would now be to choose one that he had seen and tested from up close, one who the Muslim armies of Shâm would give their full support to, one who the people of Irâq would be too scared to oppose, and one who the majority of Hijâz had already shown that they would accept.

As for the few from whom Hadhrat Muâwiyahؓ feared opposition, he could have practiced upon one of two options:

1) Have them arrested and kept under government eye, letting none come close to them, nor allowing them in any way to start any sort of revolt against the Caliph. This plan of action has, from the very beginning, been allowed in Islâm, irrespective of who the arrested party is.

In Islâm, keeping the peace and stability of the Ummah has been given great importance, so much so, that Islâm has even allowed the beheading of great personalities if there is a fear of their breaking the peace. Acting upon this very principle, Hadhrat Aliؓ raised the sword against Hadhrat Muâwiyahؓ, when he refused to pledge allegiance. Hadhrat Umarؓ, in his parting advices, explained this principle of Islâm most vividly, when he ordered Hadhrat Suheibؓ to keep watch over the six Sahâbahؓ, who had been appointed to choose the next Caliph from amongst them. Hadhrat Umarؓ's order at that time clearly showed that the Ummah accepting only one leader is most vital, and that in obtaining this purpose, even if an illustrious individual has to be executed, it shall be allowed. Hadhrat Umarؓ's words were:

صل بالناس ثلاثاً وليخل هؤلاء النفر في بيت، فإذا اجتمعوا على رجل منهم فمن خالفهم فاضربوا رأسه

(انساب الاشراف)

Lead the people in Salaah for three days, during which time they should discuss this matter privately.
If they unite upon any one man, then if any person dare oppose their decision, cut off his neck!

2) The other option that Hadhrat Muâwiyahؓ had was to now leave matters as they were, and overlook the opposition of a few, irrespective of their popularity and prominence, as long as they do not initiate any sort of revolt against the government. The second option was one which demanded a great amount of tolerance and forbearance, and a heart of sympathy,

compassion and love, which is exactly what Hadhrat Muâwiyahﷺ was blessed with.

Hadhrat Muâwiyahﷺ neither forced his decision down their throats, nor had any of them arrested and persecuted, rather he himself overlooked and ignored their opposition, and advised his son, Yazîd, to later do the same. Had Hadhrat Muâwiyahﷺ wished, he could have easily ordered their arrest and expulsion from the lands of Hijâz, or that they be executed, but nothing of that sort occurred. Rather, what the books of history show, is that Hadhrat Muâwiyahﷺ accepted the allegiance of the majority of the Ummah for his son, overlooked the opposition of the few who did not agree, and bequeathed that their opinion be respected, as long as it does not lead to chaos and strife.

The advices and wasiyah (bequest) of Hadhrat Muâwiyahﷺ to his son, Yazîd, as appears in Tabari, which has been mentioned below, shows clearly the love and respect Hadhrat Muâwiyahﷺ had for Hadhrat Huseinﷺ, and his desire to save the Ummah from in-fighting:

[59]In the sixtieth year after the Hijrah, when Hadhrat Muawiyahﷺ began feeling the pangs of death, he called Dhahaak ibn Qais, who was in charge of the police force, and Muslim ibn Uqbah, and ordered that they convey his wasiyah (parting advices) to his son, Yazîd, who was at that time absent. His wasiyah was as follows:

---

[59] ان معاوية لما حضره الموت وذلك في سنة **60** وكان يزيد غائبا فدعا بالضحاك بن قيس الفهرى وكان صاحب شرطته ومسلم بن عقبة المرى فأوصى إليهما فقال بلغا يزيد وصيتى أنظر أهل الحجاز فإنهم أصلك فأكرم من قدم عليك منهم وتعاهد من غاب وانظر أهل العراق فإن سألوك أن تعزل عنهم كل يوم عاملا فافعل فإن عزل عامل أحب إلى من أن تشهر عليك مائة ألف سيف وانظر أهل الشأم فليكونوا بطانتك وعيبتك فإن نابك شئ من عدوك فانتصر بهم فإذا أصبتهم فاردد أهل الشأم إلى بلادهم فإنهم إن أقاموا بغير بلادهم أخذوا بغير أخلاقهم وإنى لست أخاف من قريش إلا ثلاثة حسين بن على وعبد الله بن عمر وعبد الله بن الزبير فأما ابن عمر فرجل قد وقذه الدين فليس ملتمسا شيئا قبلك وأما الحسين بن على فإنه رجل خفيف وأرجو أن يكفيكه الله بمن قتل أباه وخذل أخاه وإن له رحما ماسة وحقا عظيما وقرابة من محمد صلى الله عليه وسلم ولا أظن أهل العراق تاركيه حتى يخرجوه فإن قدرت عليه فاصفح عنه فإنى لو أنى صاحبه عفوت عنه وأما ابن الزبير فإنه خب ضب فإذا شخص لك فانبذ له إلا أن يلتمس منك صلحا فإن فعل فاقبل واحقن دماء قومك ما استطعت (الطبري)

"Always be considerate to the people of Hijâz, for they are your origin. Honour the one who comes to you from them, and always be concerned of those that do not come.

As for the people of Irâq, even if they have to ask for a new leader every single day, hear their request and endeavour to fulfil it, for the changing of rulers is much less in weight than having a hundred thousand swords raised against you.

Never forget the people of Shâm! In fact regard them as the carriers of your secrets and the base of your trust. When in difficulty, seek their help, and when the difficulty gets removed, return them to their lands! Spending too much of time in foreign lands could ruin their culture and beautiful traits.
From the Qureish I fear only three! Husein ibn Ali رضي الله عنه, Abdullâh ibn Umar رضي الله عنه and Abdullâh ibn Zubeir رضي الله عنه. As for Ibn Umar رضي الله عنه, his abstinence has made him such that he shall never really show any interest in taking what you have, i.e. the caliphate.

As for Husein ibn Ali رضي الله عنه, I feel that the people of Irâq themselves, who have already assassinated his father رضي الله عنه, and deserted his brother, they shall also do him down, i.e. betray him. But remember that he is your family, his rights over us are indeed enormous, and he has been blessed with an extremely close relationship with Rasulullâh ﷺ.

I feel that the people of Irâq shall somehow or the other entice him into going back to Irâq (to start some sort of revolt). If he does do so and in the process gets arrested, then overlook his error, forgive him and set him free. Verily, if the same would happen in my life, I would surely forgive him!

Finally, regarding Ibn Zubeir رضي الله عنه, so beware of his cunning ways! If he stands in opposition, then do not leave him until he seeks a truce. If he

does do, then immediately accept and as far as possible save the blood of your nation from being spilled![60]

The death of Hadhrat Muâwiyah and an end to a glorious period of rule

After spending over forty years governing the affairs of the Ummah, twenty as governor and twenty as Caliph, during which he returned to the Ummah its stability and reinitiated the blessed act of Jihâd against the disbelievers, Hadhrat Muâwiyah at the ripe age of seventy-eight, parted from this temporary world for the eternal life of the Hereafter. To Almighty Allâh do we all belong and solely to Him shall be our return!

Before passing away, Hadhrat Muâwiyah bequeathed that he be buried in the qamees (kurta) that Rasulullâh had given him. Hadhrat Muâwiyah had some of the blessed nails of Rasulullâh by him. He asked that they be crushed in powder and placed in his eyes and mouth, after which he should be left to the mercy of Almighty Allâh, who is The Most Merciful.

As death approached, Hadhrat Muâwiyah began saying, "If only I was an ordinary man from the Qureish, in Zu-Tawaa', and had not ever had any share in governing!" (Statements of this kind were found on the tongues of many of the great rulers in Islâm, which portrayed the great fear they had in their hearts for their Creator.)

---

[60] Allâmah Tabari has also recorded another narration, wherein Hadhrat Muawiyah renders similar advice, just before his death, to Yazid directly, and in which he warns him of the danger posed by Hadhrat Abdullah ibn Umar, Hadhrat Husein, Hadhrat Abdur Rahmaan ibn Abu Bakr and Hadhrat Abdullah ibn Zubeir. The harsh words of this narration, attributed to Hadhrat Muawiyah, against these illustrious Sahâbah, itself is sufficient as an indication of fabrication. Another indication of fabrication is the fact that Hadhrat Abdur Rahmaan ibn Abu Bakr had already passed away, thus there was no need whatsoever for Hadhrat Muawiyah to take his name in the list of those he feared opposing Yazid. Thus, that narration has been ignored and the one mentioned above has been preferred.

After his death, Hadhrat Dhahaak ibn Qaisرضي الله عنه, holding the shroud of Hadhrat Muâwiyahرضي الله عنه, mounted the pulpit, saying,

"Amirul Mu'mineen, Muâwiyahرضي الله عنه was the blade and strength of the Arabs, with which Almighty Allâh brought to an end turmoil, and who Almighty Allâh gave rule over His servants, and whose armies were spread in the lands and at sea. He was a servant from the servants of Allâhجل جلاله, who Almighty Allâh has now called back. He has now completed his time and has returned to his Creator.[61]

Lessons learnt from Hajar ibn Adi'

By the grace of Almighty Allâh, in this chapter, a great deal has been mentioned, through which it is hoped that the reader shall gain some understanding of the character of Hadhrat Muâwiyahرضي الله عنه, his honourable position as a high-ranking Sahâbiرضي الله عنه, the wisdom and reasons behind his every decision, his fervent desire to keep the Ummah united, his foresight and forbearance, and finally the basis of his intention to appoint his son, Yazîd, as Caliph after him.

Great effort has been made to highlight the point that many issues in this regard have generally been regarded as unquestionable, whereas the reality is something entirely different. Basic principles have at times been ignored, just on the basis of certain unauthenticated historical

---

[61] ولما مرض كان ابنه يزيد غائبا ولما حضره الموت أوصى ان يكفن في قميص كان رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم قد كساه اياه وان يجعل مما يلي جسده وكان عنده قلامة أظفار رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم فأوصى ان تسحق وتجعل في عينيه وفمه وقال افعلوا ذلك وخلوا بيني وبين أرحم الراحمين ولما نزل به الموت قال ليتني كنت رجلا من قريش بذي طوى واني لم أل من هذا الامر شيئا ولما مات أخذ الضحاك بن قيس اكفانه وصعد المنبر وخطب الناس وقال ان أمير المؤمنين معاوية كان حد العرب وعود العرب قطع الله به الفتنة وملكه على العباد وسير جنوده في البر والبحر وكان عبدا من عبيد الله دعاه فأجابه وقد قضى نحبه (اسد الغابة)

narrations, an act which should never have been done, especially when it becomes a cause of tainting the image of illustrious Sahâbah‎ؓ and great men of the Ummah.

There would obviously be many accusations and criticism levelled against this great personality of Islâm, since the shaitaani forces of his area were scratching frantically for any piece of thread, through which they could turn the Ummah against its leader and have them call for the overthrow of the government and a return to civil strife, but the strength and tact of Hadhrat Muâwiyahؓ, earned through the duas of Rasulullâhﷺ, prevented their plots fully hatching.

The answer given by Hadhrat Muâwiyahؓ, when questioned as to why it seemed as though he was ageing fast, throws plenty of light on the extent that these forces would go to somehow try to pull him down from his seat of rule or at least taint his image in the public eye. His answer was:

كيف لا ولا أزال أرى رجلا من العرب قائما على رأسي يلقح لي كلاما يلزمني جوابه، فإن أصبت لم أحمد، وإن أخطأت سارت بها البرود (البداية)

Why should I not be ageing, when I am always being confronted by various individuals from the Arabs, levelling such criticism and remarks against me, which I am forced to answer!
Whatever good I do is ignored, but if any error occurs, its news spreads like wild-fire!

The crux of the matter is that the accusations and criticism levelled against the rulers of Islâm, especially during its initial era, never had any substance and weight behind it, but the manner it was propagated, that made it seem as though it was something major.

Hadhrat Mufti Muhammad Taqi' Uthmani Sâhib has made mention of some of the weightier accusations levelled against Hadhrat Muâwiyahؓ, in his book, 'Hadhrat Muâwiyah aur Târikhi Haqâ'iq' and

has provided detailed answers explaining the truth behind each of those accusations. Since work has already been done in this sphere, I have chosen to not delve into these issues.

However, since a great lesson regarding history can be learnt from one of the issues that Hadhrat Mufti Taqi Sâhib has discussed, I shall spare a few moments to briefly outline that issue and then draw attention to the point to be learnt from the incident.

The incident concerns Hadhrat Hajar ibn Adi', a senior Tabi'ee and a man of extreme piety, who, due to unknowingly being spurred by shaitaani forces in Muslim guise, would continuously spearhead efforts to have Hadhrat Muâwiyah رضي الله عنه overthrown. At times his attacks on the government would be merely verbal and at times physical. In fact, he was one of the sincere ones who wrote to Hadhrat Husein رضي الله عنه that he had under his belt many, many fighters who were ready to immediately lend their support to Hadhrat Husein رضي الله عنه, if he decided standing up against the rule of Muâwiyah رضي الله عنه.

Hadhrat Hajar ibn Adi' was finally arrested, after spearheading an unsuccessful rebellion against the ruling party, and sent to Hadhrat Muâwiyah رضي الله عنه to make a ruling regarding him. After hearing and receiving testimony from many Sahâbah رضي الله عنه and Tâbi'een, that Hadhrat Hajar had, without any doubt, spearheaded attacks and revolts against the Islâmic state, Hadhrat Muâwiyah رضي الله عنه ordered his execution.

Hadhrat Hajar was a man of great piety, thus news of his execution would obviously shock many. The very shaitaani forces who had until now been using Hajar ibn Adi' for their ulterior, filthy motives, immediately moved into step two of their plan, which was to now propagate and portray his execution as an act of barbarism, injustice, cruelty, etc. Their propaganda, as is the case with all their propaganda until today, caused tears to be shed for Hajar, in places far and wide. So strong was their manner of portraying Hajar as a hero, who died fighting for the truth, that Hadhrat Ayesha رضي الله عنها, despite the unique

respect she held for Hadhrat Muâwiyahؓ, was also angered at the decision, and when Hadhrat Muâwiyahؓ later visited her, during a trip for Umrah, sheؓ, immediately brought up the issue.

Hadhrat Muâwiyahؓ's decision regarding Hajar ibn Adi' was definitely correct, but due to the picture of the incident having been portrayed all over the Islâmic world totally different from its reality, whoever would hear it would regard Hadhrat Muâwiyahؓ blame-worthy.

As for Hadhrat Muâwiyahؓ, he was so convinced that his decision regarding Hajar had been correct, that after explaining his reasons to Hadhrat Ayeshaؓ regarding why he had issued the order for Hajar's execution, heؓ ended the discussion regarding Hajar ibn Adi' saying:

دعني و حجرًا حتى نلتقي عند ربنا (اسد الغابة)

Allow me and Hajar to sort this matter out amongst ourselves, in front of our Creator

Hadhrat Muâwiyahؓ would never have said the above had he not been confident that in front of Almighty Allâh he would be able to adequately answer why he had decided in the case of Hajar as he had decided.

In the mind of Hadhrat Muâwiyahؓ the principle of ijtihâd was well-grained, that Almighty Allâh is the only True Judge, in front of Who is every event, seen from every angle. When looked at from the angle of Hajar ibn Adi', Almighty Allâh knows well that Hajar was sincere in his attempts to remove what he felt was incorrect. Hajar had no idea whatsoever that the ones spurring him to do what he was doing were in fact using him for sinister motives, i.e. to start some form of uprising and push the Ummah back into civil strife. Almighty Allâh would never deal with Hajar as Heﷻ will deal with the hypocrites operating behind the shield of Hajar, despite them all being of the same camp, since by Allâhﷻ man shall be judged upon his intention, and not just the outside picture. Where the satanic hypocrites would be flung headlong into Jahannum, at the very same time Hajar ibn Adi' will find himself

being crowned with the crown of a martyr, who died for the establishment of the truth.

As for Hadhrat Muâwiyah ﷻ, Almighty Allâh shall judge his action, looking at it from his angle, and not the angle of Hajar ibn Adi. Hadhrat Muâwiyah's reasons behind ordering the execution of a pious soul shall be kept in front and on account of these reasons Hadhrat Muâwiyah shall also be declared 'correct in his judgement' and rewarded for his efforts.

Whosoever studies the entire incident of Hajar ibn Adi', either from the writings of Hadhrat Mufti Taqi Uthmani Sâhib, in 'Hadhrat Muâwiyah aur Târikhi Haqâiq', or from any other book, keeping in mind the principles of studying history, which has thus far been mentioned, he shall surely admit that neither was Hadhrat Muâwiyah wrong in his decision to execute Hajar ibn Adi', and neither shall Hajar ibn Adi' be held blameworthy in the Hereafter for his deeds. Each one, when looking at the incident from his side, shall easily be able to prove that had any other upright person been in his shoes, he would have made the very same decision.

The entire incident, as we have it today, presented in front of us to read and study from different angles, these details were neither in front of Hadhrat Muâwiyah, nor in front of Hajar ibn Adi', thus it would be totally unfair to today read the incident, and then reclining in our soft couches, have the audacity to question why Hadhrat Muâwiyah did this, or why Hadhrat Hajar did that. Almighty Allâh shall judge them on account of how they saw the picture, not on account of how we today see the picture. When in the eyes of Almighty Allâh both shall be worthy of reward and praise, would it then ever make sense to us, who are not at all aware of what our own condition shall be tomorrow, to take the seat of 'self-appointed judge' and issue verdicts of guilt against any one of the two.

Through the incident of Hadhrat Muâwiyah and Hajar ibn Adi' the principle of Ijtihaad has been made very clear. If you have properly understood this point, you shall now find it quite easy to apply this principle to all the other 'mushaajaraat' (internal conflicts) that occurred from the very beginning and continue until today.

Where Hadhrat Uthmaan was martyred oppressively, at the same time you shall be able to understand that not every single individual involved in the rebellion against Hadhrat Uthmaan is to be regarded as evil. Where many had evil intentions from the very beginning, there were definitely just as many who were pulled into the rebellion innocently. Where some of the killers of Hadhrat Uthmaan were nothing but Satanists, operating hypocritically, there were many others who were sincere devotees of Islâm, desirous of only good, and totally unaware of what was to unfold thereafter.

Similarly, where Hadhrat Ali had just reasons for delaying in bringing the killers to court, Hadhrat Muâwiyah, when looking at the picture from his angle, shall be found just as correct in refusing to pledge allegiance, as long as the killers were not taken to task. This is how Almighty Allâh shall rule between both these parties, thus we should never feel brave enough to try and offer any other ruling. Hadhrat Ali, Hadhrat Uthmaan and Hadhrat Muâwiyah shall surely be found holding hands in Jannah, and satan-worshipping individuals who operated hypocritically, some serving in the quarters of Hadhrat Ali, and others in the quarters of Hadhrat Muâwiyah, despite apparently being under the banner of the truth, their abode shall be nothing but hell.

This is a golden principle in understanding the internal conflicts of the past, the summary of which is that each party did what he did, due to seeing the picture from his angle. The whole picture, as we can perhaps see it today, was never in front, and thus his ruling can never be expected to have been in accordance to the demands of the entire

picture. His responsibility was Ijtihâd, using whatever knowledge was at the moment present in front of him, and that is exactly what he did, and upon that shall Almighty Allâh judge him.

At the same time, there would always be powerful satanic elements, operating from both sides, and painting pictures in front of both parties, whose falsehood would years later emerge, but at that moment would be understood as true. Each party would thus at times make decisions based on false pictures and fabricated information put forward, and this would obviously just lend wood to an already burning fire.

When Almighty Allâh shall judge, Heﷻ shall never reprimand the one who was sincere in his intentions but erred in his Ijtihâd, rather he shall be rewarded for his efforts and sent straight into Paradise. Destruction and misery shall never be his lot, but rather the lot of the hypocrites operating from within. As Almighty Allâh states:

وَمِنَ النَّاسِ مَنْ يَقُولُ آمَنَّا بِاللَّهِ وَبِالْيَوْمِ الْآخِرِ وَمَا هُمْ بِمُؤْمِنِينَ (٨) يُخَادِعُونَ اللَّهَ وَالَّذِينَ آمَنُوا وَمَا يَخْدَعُونَ إِلَّا أَنْفُسَهُمْ وَمَا يَشْعُرُونَ (٩)

فِي قُلُوبِهِمْ مَرَضٌ فَزَادَهُمُ اللَّهُ مَرَضًا وَلَهُمْ عَذَابٌ أَلِيمٌ بِمَا كَانُوا يَكْذِبُونَ

Amongst man are those who make claims of Imaan on Allâh and the Last Day, whereas in reality they have no belief whatsoever. Their intention is merely to deceive Allâh and the believers, but in actual fact they are deceiving none but themselves. In their hearts there is filth (i.e. the filth of kufr), and Allâh allows them to make it even filthier (i.e. with their plots against Imaan, which initially always appears successful). For them is a severe punishment, on account of what they have earned!!!

In the internal conflicts of the past, on both sides one shall find innocent, sincere men, being spurred against each other by hypocrite forces. For the sincere, Almighty Allâh has written forgiveness and

reward, and for the hypocrites operating from both sides Almighty Allâh has destined total destruction.

This golden principle must now be applied to the internal conflict that occurred between Hadhrat Husein رضي الله عنه and his cousin, Yazîd, and to the conflict that occurred between Hadhrat Abdullâh ibn Zubeir رضي الله عنه and Abdul Malik ibn Marwaan, and to all other internal conflicts that continue until today, and then see what conclusion and judgement you reach.

In the next issue, the incident of Karbala shall Insha-Allâh be dissected to quite an extent, but if this principle can be kept in the front of one's mind, it shall already provide answers to most of the unanswered questions regarding Karbala, and it shall help tremendously in explaining the conflicting reports regarding everything surrounding Karbala. (And Almighty Allâh alone guides towards the entire truth)

Returning back to the original discussion, mention was made that Hadhrat Muâwiyah رضي الله عنه would obviously have been criticized on numerous accounts and occasions, due to the satanic forces working full force to somehow or the other de-throne him or at least spoil his reputation in the public eye.

Hadhrat Mufti Taqi Uthmani Sâhib has, in his book, in a beautiful manner has explained the reality behind those accusations, thus there is no need to repeat it all here.

The final two issues

Only two accusations that generally stand out vividly, due to the intense manner in which it has been propagated, shall, as a conclusion to this part, be discussed.

1) Why did Hadhrat Muâwiyahؓ appoint his son, Yazîd, as Caliph, despite being aware of the opposition of great Sahâbahؓ?
2) Rasulullahﷺ had mentioned[62] that the caliphate shall last for thirty years, (which would end in the 40th year after Hijrah) after which the era of kingship shall begin. Does this then not make clear indication that the rule of Hadhrat Muâwiyahؓ was a disliked rule due to it beginning after the fortieth year of the Hijrah?

In the pages that have passed, much of issue No.1 has been discussed, from which it has become apparent that:

a) Hadhrat Muâwiyahؓ's decision had nothing to do with holding onto power
b) Yazîd was not, during the life of his father, regarded as unfit for the post
c) The majority of the people of that era were happy with the decision
d) There was no other solution which Hadhrat Muâwiyahؓ could see, which would ensure the unity of the Ummah remains intact and infighting does not re-occur
e) The appointment of Yazîd was an issue of Ijtihâd, for which Almighty Allâh has promised reward, even though one errs in his final judgement
f) It was never necessary that Hadhrat Muâwiyahؓ submit to the view of the Sahâbahؓ opposing his decision, nor was it necessary that he seek their opinion
g) Selecting one's son as Caliph is totally permissible in Islâm, on condition that the son be fit for the post.
h) The basis of the opposition to Hadhrat Muâwiyahؓ's decision was never the personality of Yazîd, his character, actions, etc, as has been generally understood, but rather the fear that appointing

[62] الخلافة في أمتي ثلاثون سنة ثم ملكا بعد ذلك (السنن الكبرى للنسائي)

one's close family members would open up the door of Hirqaliyat (the throne of rule being held by one family, irrespective of ability, piety, etc.)

i) Hadhrat Muâwiyah, until his death, upheld the honour of the Ahle-Bait, and instructed his son, Yazîd, to do the same

What has to now be discussed is issue No.2, with an explanation of the hadith of caliphate and mulookiyah (kingship), which shall provide the reason behind Hadhrat Muâwiyah being prepared to take the throne, knowing full well that the era of caliphate had now terminated.

To understand this issue, it would first be necessary to discuss the difference between caliphate and mulookiyah (kingship), to understand the Shar'ie ruling of both, and then to study the Ahâdith regarding this issue.

Caliphate and Mulookiyah (kingship)

From the very onset it must be understood that Mulookiyat (kingship) and Hirqaliyat (system of succession) are not one and the same. When Hadhrat Abdullâh ibn Zubeir, Hadhrat Abdur Rahmaan ibn Abu Bakr, etc, voiced dissatisfaction against the appointment of Yazîd as the next Caliph, they explained the reason of their dissatisfaction being that his appointment was opening the door for 'Hirqaliyah' (a system of succession, that every time one would pass away, another family member would immediately take his place, even though he was not at all capable for the post). Had Hirqaliyah (system of succession) and Mulookiyah (kingship) been the same, they would never have accepted the rule of Hadhrat Muâwiyah as well, since they were all well aware that after the 40th year of Hijrah, the era of kingship was to begin.

Hadhrat Hasan, when handing over the caliphate to Hadhrat Muâwiyah, made it very clear that the underlining reason for doing

so was that the era of caliphate had now terminated, and he did not desire ruling as a king. When Hadhrat Muâwiyah ﵁ accepted the caliphate, he too accepted it knowing full well that the era of caliphate had terminated, and even openly expressed that despite the era of caliphate having come to an end, he was prepared to accept the responsibility of rule, even though it would be through the system of Mulookiyah (kingship).

Had Mulookiyah (kingship) and Hirqaliyah (system of succession) been the same, the Sahâbah who voiced opposition against Yazîd's appointment would have also voiced their opposition against Hadhrat Muâwiyah ﵁'s appointment, which they never did.

Had Mulookiyah had the same meaning as Hirqaliyah, there would have been no need for Hadhrat Hasan ﵁ to hand the Caliphate over so quickly, since there was still to be another twenty years plus before the 'so called' system of Hirqaliyah would start.

Had Mulookiyah had the same meaning as Hirqaliyah, the Ahâdith would not have mentioned the 41^{st} year after Hijrah as the beginning of Mulookiyah, but rather the 60^{th} year of Hijrah, since it was only around that time that Hadhrat Muâwiyah ﵁ began thinking of appointing Yazîd.

What then is the meaning of Mulookiyah? If one were to ponder over the make-up and the root (masdar) of the two words, i.e. caliphate and mulookiyah, much of this shall be answered, the details of which are as follows:

The word 'ملك – with a kasra under the 'Laam', which translates as 'king', comes from the root word 'ملك – with a dhammah on the 'Meem', which means to rule. As for the word 'Caliph' it comes from the root خلف which literally translates as 'to come after, to come from behind, a successor'.

Looking at the root word, one shall find that much of the meaning of 'Caliph' can be found in a king and vice-versa. A Caliph succeeds another ruler, and so does a king. He comes from behind and so too does a king. A king rules, and so too does a Caliph.

The only difference is that a Caliph becomes a ruler, and succeeds primarily through initial appointment (الاستخلاف), whereas this is not necessary for a king. Nabi Adam عليه السلام was a Caliph of Almighty Allâh on earth, due to his being appointed and selected for the responsibility. As for a king, being selected by the masses, or by a large group of upright men and scholars, this is not conditional. A king may become king through force, by waging wars and attacking village after village and town after town, until its inhabitants finally surrender to his command.

A Caliph is one who does not work and fight for his selection. Yes, after the majority or the main core of the scholars and men of piety select him as Caliph, there shall naturally be those who still oppose the decision. At that time, to save the system of caliphate, the Caliph is permitted to wage war against those refusing to pledge allegiance.

In short, in caliphate the underlining issue is the selection of an individual, after which he, the Caliph, shall then work towards strengthening the empire, whereas in Mulookiyah, the underlining issue is to acquire rule and to get oneself accepted, which is achieved through permissible avenues, and many a time through impermissible avenues, e.g. oppression, propaganda, false promises made during campaigning, etc.

If one, as a king, rules justly, he shall be rewarded, and if one after being selected (made Caliph) abuses his post, he shall be severely taken to task.

A Caliph and King, both are rulers, both come after someone else, and both shall either get rewarded or punished, in accordance, not to the name of their position, but rather to the work they do in that position.

Merely being a Caliph never meant that one now becomes exempt from Divine Punishment, and neither does being a king make one worthy of punishment. It all has to do with what work one carries out and has nothing to do with what title one carries.

Had Mulookiyah (kingship) demanded punishment and retribution, then no sane believer, forget one who holds the rank of a Sahâbi رضي الله عنه, would have openly expressed happiness to take over through the system of Mulookiyah. Would a Sahâbi رضي الله عنه ever say that he was more than happy to allow the burden of a major sin upon his shoulders?!

Once, when Hadhrat Muâwiyah was taunted that he is not a Caliph but merely a king, he replied that although the responsibility of the Ummah was not destined to reach him through the system of caliphate, he was still quite happy to accept it through the system of kingship. Had kingship alone been a sin and an act of oppression, do you think Hadhrat Muâwiyah رضي الله عنه would ever have said this? On that occasion his words were:

تخبرنا أنا ملوك فقد رضينا أن نكون ملوكا [63]

You are telling us (in a taunting manner) that we are mere kings, whereas we are more than happy to be mere kings!

After having understood this, one can easily understand why the era after the 40th year of Hijrah was declared as an era of Mulookiyah, why Hadhrat Hasan رضي الله عنه was not prepared to hold onto rule and why Hadhrat Muâwiyah رضي الله عنه was ready to accept it.

Hadhrat Abu Bakr رضي الله عنه, Hadhrat Umar رضي الله عنه, Hadhrat Uthmaaan رضي الله عنه, and Hadhrat Ali رضي الله عنه, all of these illustrious personalities were selected to lead the Ummah, thus each one was 'a Caliph'. There was no rival competition, and thus no need to fight for rule. Their taking the seat of

---

[63] تاريخ مدينة دمشق لابن عساكر

rule was purely due to being selected by others, without them having to lift a sword.

Even during the era of Hadhrat Ali﵁, when Hadhrat Muâwiyah﵁ refused to pledge allegiance, it was never due to him rivalling for the post of Caliph. In fact, Hadhrat Muâwiyah﵁ mentioned on numerous occasions that as soon as the killers of Hadhrat Uthmaan﵁ are put on trial, he will immediately pledge allegiance. The era of the first four Caliphs of Islâm was termed as an era of Caliphate due to the fact the each leader during this era would be selected by others, without him having any rival for the post against whom he would first have to fight.

Then, when the issue of arbitration arose, during the end of Hadhrat Ali﵁'s life, despite it not reaching any final decision, so much was definitely made clear that in the event of Hadhrat Ali﵁ stepping down from the post of Caliphate, the decision for the next leader was not going to be a unanimous one. Some were now going to be in favour of Hadhrat Abdullâh ibn Umar﵁, some in favour of Hadhrat Hasan﵁, and some in favour of Hadhrat Muâwiyah﵁. Hadhrat Abdullâh ibn Umar﵁ would most probably never have accepted the caliphate, thus the fight for the post would now be concentrated between Hadhrat Muâwiyah﵁ and Hadhrat Hasan﵁.

When Hadhrat Hasan﵁ was appointed as Caliph by the people of Irâq, and accepted by majority in Hijaaz, he﵁ knew very well that Hadhrat Muâwiyah﵁ and the majority of Shâm, which was the central army of Islâm, were not going to readily accept his caliphate. He﵁ understood, through the indication of the Ahâdith, that the era of being unanimously selected and having no opposition had now come to an end, and the seat of rule would now go to whosoever was ready to fight for it and win. Hadhrat Hasan﵁, in accordance to his nature from the very beginning, was never going to be prepared to have blood spilled merely so that he could keep his post, and for this reason handed the reins of rule over to Hadhrat Muâwiyah﵁.

When Hadhrat Muâwiyah ﵁ was given the post, he ﵁ also understood that it had not reached him through any unanimous decision, but rather just so that further bloodshed could be avoided. He ﵁ was well aware that the manner 'rulership' had reached him was different from that of the previous Caliphs, but at the same time understood that acquiring rule, whether through the method of unanimous selection, known as Isthikhlaaf (being made a Caliph), or whether through the method of Mulookiyah (fighting for the position), both were permissible, as long as the underlining intention was good. This was what Hadhrat Muâwiyah ﵁ meant when he said that if rule had to come in his hands through the system of Mulookiyah (i.e. due to force and power), then too he ﵁ was prepared to accept it, especially when this now seemed the only way that stability was going to be restored for the Ummah.

Hadhrat Muâwiyah ﵁ had already realized that as long as the caliphate was going to be kept close to Irâq, satanist forces, operating primarily from there, would continuously be igniting some or the other form of trouble and dissension. Moving the Islâmic government away from their central base would at least minimize their influence, and history bears testimony that this was exactly what thereafter happened. For the next twenty years the Ummah were able to experience peace within their lands, the wheels of Jihâd began spinning again, new territories were conquered, the Khawârij were hunted down, and the treacherous attacks of satanic hypocrites, working from within, were brought to an abrupt end.

Satan's forces now found that their only hope of success in crushing Islâm from within lay in bringing down the Ummayyad Dynasty (the government of Hadhrat Muâwiyah ﵁ which ruled from Shâm) and somehow or the other shifting the caliphate back to Irâq. The entire escapade of Karbala was solely so that this could be achieved. By winning the sympathy of the Ummah against the Caliphate, through

the blood of Hadhrat Husein رضي الله عنه, and through the slogan of 'revenge for the Ahle-Bait', the Ummah would now unknowingly be pitted against the ruling government, thereby weakening its pillars and laying the foundation for it to one day be overthrown.

Insha-Allâh, in the next part, an attempt shall be made to dissect the incident of Karbala itself, together with answering pertinent issues which have generally been ignored, so that a clearer picture of the incident may come to the fore, and the true conspirators behind the assassination Hadhrat Husein رضي الله عنه may get exposed.

May Almighty Allâh guide all towards that which is right and bless us to do that which pleases Him.

Aameen

Completed, with the kindness and favour of Almighty Allâh, on the 14th of Sha'baan 1434 (A.H.)

Karbala

A 'Bloody' Conspiracy and The Secrets Behind It

(Part 2)

The first call to stand up against the Ummayyad rule

During the era of Hadhrat Muawiyah﵁, despite the efforts of the satanic hypocrite forces not ceasing; due to the unique ability of leadership which Hadhrat Muawiyah﵁ had been blessed with, their efforts found hardly any success.

As mentioned in the previous part, the calls for overthrowing the government had been made numerous times during the rule of Hadhrat Muawiyah﵁, with letters being sent, first to Hadhrat Hasan﵁, and after his death, to Hadhrat Husein﵁, but for various reasons, consideration was hardly given to their letters.

Hadhrat Hasan﵁, after having seen the conduct of the people of Iraq first-hand, knew quite well that the voices of many of its population were nothing but hypocritical. He had heard them proclaiming untold love for him, much more than even that which they had once claimed for Hadhrat Ali﵁, but as soon as he expressed his desire to bring back unity for the Ummah, by handing over the caliphate to Hadhrat Muâwiyah﵁, in a second all their claims of love disappeared and thereafter during his short stay in Iraq, he received nothing from these once-loyal supporters, except filthy remarks, criticism of the worst level, and even a physical attack upon his most noble body.

Hadhrat Hasan﵁ was thus most wary when letters began reaching him in Madinah Munawwara, begging that he return to lead a revolt against the present Ummayyad government. Behind these numerous letters, Hadhrat Hasan﵁ could see another sinister plot hatching, with nothing but bloodshed, treachery, and further shaitaani schemes resulting from it.

Hadhrat Hasanﷺ, on numerous occasions, expressed his dissatisfaction with those fragments in Iraq, who were forever moaning and complaining regarding their rulers, and who were always eager to reignite some sort of fire amongst the Ummah.

The following statement of Hadhrat Hasanﷺ, as recorded in Mu'jam Tabrani, with a strong chain of narrators, which has previously been mentioned, clearly indicates to most of what has been mentioned above:

Yazîd ibn Al-Asam narrates that once whilst on a journey with Hadhrat Hasan ibn Aliﷺ, a bundle of letters reached him., Hadhrat Hasanﷺ called for a container, and had water poured into it. He then threw the letters into the water, without even bothering to glance at its contents. I asked, 'O Abu Muhammad (Hadhrat Hasanﷺ), who has sent all of these letters?' He replied, 'It has come from the people of Iraq, a group that shall never accept the truth, and shall never desist from their evil! As for myself, <u>I do not fear being deceived by these people</u>. However I do fear that they may have an impact on him!' Saying this Hadhrat Hasanﷺ pointed towards Hadhrat Huseinﷺ.'[64]

[64] روى الطبراني في المعجم الكبير عن ابن عُيينة، عن عُبيد الله بن عبد الله بن الأصم، عن عمه يزيد بن الأصم، قال: خرجتُ مع الحسن (يعني ابن علي رضي الله عنهما) وجاريةٌ تَحُتُّ شيئا من الحِنَّاءِ عن أظفاره، فجاءتْهُ إِضْبارَةٌ من كُتُب، فقال: يا جاريةَ هاتي المِخْضَب، فصبَّ عليه ماءً، وألقى الكُتُب في الماء، فلم يفتح منها شيئا، ولم ينظر إليه، فقلتُ: يا أبا محمد! ممن هذه الكُتُب؟ قال: من أهل العراق، من قوم لا يرجعون إلى حقٍ، ولا يقصرون عن باطل، أما إني لستُ أخشاهم على نفسي، ولكني أخشاهم على ذلك. وأشار إلى الحسين. (وسنده جيد على شرط مسلم ، وقال الهيثمي في المجمع : ورجاله رجال الصحيح، غير عبد الله بن الحكم بن أبي زياد، وهو ثقة)

The reason behind Hadhrat Husein ﷺ standing up against Yazîd ibn Muawiyah

Understanding this issue is vital for anyone desirous of understanding the deeper reality of Karbala, and the role that Yazîd had played in this entire episode.

Due to immense shia propaganda and influence, many have been unfortunately bluffed into believing that the underlining reason behind Hadhrat Husein ؓ proceeding to Iraq was that Yazîd had turned renegade, or that he was oppressing the masses, or that he had begun committing open adultery, or that he had now become an open transgressor, or that he had fallen totally into drinking liquor, etc.

Yet, if one were to be asked to provide some sound evidence for the above, he shall find that despite these allegations being recorded in many books, none have ever provided any solid chain of narrators, reaching up to any reliable person, who had witnessed any of these acts from Yazîd.

It should be understood well, that the punishment for acts of the above nature, in Islâmic circles, has been termed as 'hadd', i.e. punishment decreed by Divine Law, which no judge, leader, etc, can overrule. If one were to thus say that Yazîd had indeed perpetrated these acts in the open, as mentioned in historical narrations, then one would automatically be admitting that during this period of Yazîdi rule, all the scholars, Tâbi'een and even the Sahâbah ؓ of Shâm and its surrounding areas, had either become cowards, or had themselves fallen into gross sin, by ignoring his vile acts of open transgression, and not even voicing dissatisfaction that the Islâmic Laws of 'Hadd' were being totally discarded!

Had Yazîd really been doing such acts, do you really think that Hadhrat Nu'maan ibn Bashir ؓ, a prominent Sahâbi ؓ, would remain quite, and

continue serving as Yazîd's close confidant?! Do you think that Yazîd's awe was such that it could subdue and silence every Tabi'ee and Tabe'-Tabi'ee in Shâm, which as the Ahâdith had described, was the fort of Islâm?! Why can the books of history not provide a single eye-witness report, from any reliable witness, who had seen Yazîd doing these actions?

Taking it slightly further, in Islâmic Law, if one openly accuses another of adultery, he would be asked to present four reliable witnesses, and if he fails to comply, he himself would be subjected to eighty lashes, on account of 'Qazaf' (a false accusation of adultery). Had Yazîd, in his era and in his land, really been openly accused of adultery, there would have been at least one case, where a witness would have been asked, by some or the other judge, spread across the length and breadth of Shâm, to bring forth witnesses.

Anyone, with a slight amount of knowledge regarding the strict conditions laid down for one's witness of adultery to be accepted, would know well that had any accuser ever been asked to bring forth witnesses, he would most likely have failed to do so, and would then have been subjected to the punishment of eighty lashes, whereas this too cannot be found in any historical narration! Why?

Could it be that the judges of that era, which was still the era of the Tâbi'een, known as Khairul-Quroon (the best of eras), could it be that all those judges had now, for some strange reason, decided unanimously to discard the laws of 'Qazaf (false accusation)' and turn a deaf ear to all the accusations of adultery being openly made against the present Caliph?!

If one's mind finds accepting the above difficult, then the only other possibility that exists, in my limited understanding, is that during the era of Yazîd, in the lands of Shâm, no open accusation of adultery,

drinking, transgression, etc, had been leveled against Yazîd, thus the need to investigate these accusations never arose.

In fact, if one were to now ponder deeply over what has been narrated in the books of history, one shall find ample evidence that the reasons behind Hadhrat Husein رضي الله عنه standing up against Yazîd had nothing ever to do with Yazîd being an open transgressor, an adulterer, etc.

Some narrations and points of interest shall Insha-Allâh now be mentioned, through which, if studied with an open heart, one shall clearly see the truth of what has just been mentioned.

1) Hadhrat Husein رضي الله عنه, had already, in the era of Hadhrat Muawiyah رضي الله عنه expressed his dissatisfaction with the decision to have Yazîd appointed as caliph. Obviously, during that time, Yazîd could not have been committing vile acts in the palace of his illustrious father. What then was the reason, at that time, for Hadhrat Husein رضي الله عنه to openly reject Hadhrat Muâwiyah رضي الله عنه's decision to have his son, Yazîd, appointed as the next caliph?

   Will it not make sense that the reason for Hadhrat Husein رضي الله عنه later standing up against Yazîd be the very same reason for Hadhrat Husein رضي الله عنه initially not accepting the rule of Yazîd? Yet, when one studies the reasons listed behind Hadhrat Husein رضي الله عنه standing up against Yazîd, the initial, true reason, forget being at the top of the list, hardly finds any mention, even at the bottom of the list. Why?

   The reason for this, in my understanding, is that had the true reason for Hadhrat Husein رضي الله عنه's dissatisfaction with Yazîd's rule been mentioned, the sympathy and tears for the Ahle-Bait, and the anger and resentment against the entire Ummayyad dynasty, which the satanic/hypocrite forces were desirous of obtaining through the martyrdom of Hadhrat Husein رضي الله عنه, that would never have been attained.

The only way to create sympathy and support for their sinister plot to overthrow the present Ummayyad government was to create in the minds of all a picture of a blessed soul, devoted to the truth, i.e. Hadhrat Husein, without any support from the Sahâbah and Tâbi'een of Hijâz, Shâm, Iraq, and the rest of the Muslim world, standing up all alone to eradicate the evils of drinking, oppression, adultery, etc, which were now being committed openly by the leaders of Shâm, and in fact by the caliph, Yazîd, himself.

After ingraining this picture in the minds of the masses, through mass propaganda, it would only be natural that all would lend support to any and every movement that would later rise in a so-called rally to have revenge taken for the Ahle-Bait, irrespective of who would be spearheading the movement, and irrespective of the filth and atrocities that would accompany every such rally.

As with regards to the initial reasons for Hadhrat Husein being dissatisfied with the rule of Yazîd, had those reasons been allowed to come forth, all would have understood that the struggle between Hadhrat Husein and Yazîd was solely and only an *Ijtihâdi Ikhtilaafi* issue (i.e. an issue in which parties differ, after having made a sincere exerted effort to find a solution).

In the battles between Hadhrat Ali and Hadhrat Muawiyah, thousands of illustrious souls had attained martyrdom, yet all understood that this conflict was based solely on *Ijtihâd*, in which each party, due to his sincerity and good intentions, was absolved, from the very beginning, by Almighty Allâh, of retribution in the Hereafter. Due to this understanding, when Hadhrat Muawiyah later took complete control, not a single sincere believer, despite his own family having being killed by the forces of Hadhrat Muawiyah just a few years ago, would even entertain the thought of taking revenge, forget practically standing up to do so.

To make a successful call of 'revenge' it was vital for such a picture to be painted in the minds of all that would cause tears to pour from the eyes and blood to boil on the mere mention of Karbala, a picture that would include, amongst other things, the sad and sorrowful scenes of:

a) A struggle of truth against falsehood
b) A struggle of one brave soldier against the united armies of evil
c) A bloody encounter, in which the leader of the youth of Jannah is left to die a dreadful death, suffering in thirst till the very last moment of his blessed life
d) An evil ruler mocking at the fate of the beloved grandson of Rasulullâhﷺ
e) A picture of the wives and daughters of Hadhrat Husein رضي الله عنه being jeered, taunted, and disgraced

The actual purpose of the hypocrites of Iraq and surrounding areas behind Karbala was to initiate a call of 'revenge' and for their call to have effect, sorrowful scenes and open lies had to be propagated to such an extent, that it would reach a level of so-called 'absolute truth', which should never be questioned, similar to the so-called 'gospel truth' regarding the attacks of September 11, known as 911.

Amongst those lies, one batch of lies, in my understanding, is with regards to the character and private life of Yazîd, in which Yazîd has been portrayed as a villain, an evil monster, an adulterer, a drunkard, a renegade, etc!

2) If Yazîd was really drinking liquor and committing adultery openly, why was this irritating the people of Iraq, who were thousands of miles away, and not the people of Shâm, who lived right around Yazîd?

Also, assuming that there really was some truth in the complaints that came from certain fractions of Iraq, regarding Yazîd, and if Yazîd's evil conduct was really the reason behind their calls for rebellion, the question would then arise as to why then had they sent to Hadhrat Husein similar letters calling for rebellion, during the era of Hadhrat Muawiyah himself. Was Hadhrat Muawiyah also committing such filthy and vile acts?!

In Al-Bidâyah, Allâmah ibn Kathir has narrated that after the death of Hadhrat Hasan, Musayyib ibn Utbah Al-Fazari, together with a group of Iraqis, came to Hadhrat Husein and begged him to break his allegiance from Hadhrat Muâwiyah. What was the reason for these Iraqis being upset with the rule of Hadhrat Muâwiyah? Was it that Hadhrat Muawiyah was flagrantly breaking the commands of Almighty Allâh (Nauuzubillah), or was it rather that certain satanic fractions in Iraq, Egypt and surrounding areas were continuously on the lookout for some sort of excuse to reignite war amongst the Ummah, and if such excuses could not be found, they would then be prepared to themselves create such excuses?

3) When the first letters from Iraq reached Madinah Munawwara, calling for Hadhrat Husein to come over to Kufa and spearhead their rally for a new leader, if one were to ponder over the contents of those letters, and the quick manner that it reached Hadhrat Husein, one would realise that:

   a) In those letters no mention had been made that Yazîd was committing open adultery, drinking, etc

   b) In those letters, instead of complaining against Yazîd, complaints were actually being made against the Ummayyad governor in

Iraq, Hadhrat Nu’maan ibn Bashir ﵁, who was in fact a prominent Sahâbi ﵁

c) The speed with which these letters reached Madinah Munawwara greatly indicate that these letters had already been prepared, and were just being held back until the death of Hadhrat Muawiyah ﵁ before it could be sent out.

Otherwise, in such a short space of time, could one ever imagine this possible that immediately after the death of Hadhrat Muawiyah ﵁, Yazîd throws open the doors of all evil in the court of caliphate, the news of his evil rapidly spreads all the way to Iraq, the people of Iraq unite against him, letters are written and signed by different clans and prominent men, and all these letters get delivered to Madinah Munawwara, reaching even before the news of the death of Hadhrat Muawiyah ﵁ gets conveyed to the people, since Hadhrat Husein ﵁’s refusal to pledge allegiance to the new caliph occurred as soon as the news of the death of Hadhrat Muawiyah ﵁ reached Madinah Munawwara?

If the reason for Hadhrat Husein ﵁’s refusal to pledge allegiance was due to Yazîd being involved in all sorts of evil, how could it be possible that the news of Yazîd’s evil conduct could travel so fast, first to Iraq and from there to Madinah Munawwara, arriving even before Yazîd could send out his own letter to Madinah Munawwara, directly from Shâm, informing the people of the death of his father?!

Below are some extracts of the first letters that reached Hadhrat Husein ﵁, addressed from the people of Iraq, as narrated in Tarikh-e-Tabari, narrating from Abu Mikhnaf (a staunch shia, whose narrations would normally be overlooked, but has been narrated here to show that even according to their own sources, the initial letters sent to

Hadhrat Husein ﷺ, had no mention of the evil of Yazîd as the reason behind their calling Hadhrat Husein ﷺ over to Iraq):

In the name of Allâh, Most Beneficent, Most Merciful
To Husein ibn Ali, from Suleiman ibn Sard, Musaayib ibn Najbah, Rifaa'ah ibn Shaddad, Habib ibn Muzaahir, and all his (Husein ﷺ's) supporters of Kufa. May Peace be upon you. We praise Allâh, besides whom there is no deity. All praise is due to Allâh, who has brought an end to your most oppressive enemy, the one who had pounced upon the Ummah and unjustly taken the seat of rule, who had killed the good of this Ummah, and left the evil, who had made the wealth of Allâh as his own treasure. May he be kept far from Divine Mercy, as was the case of Thamud.[65]

(Nauuzubillah!!! As already mentioned, the narrator of this incident, Abu Mikhnaf, was a staunch shi'ee, who never felt shy to blurt out any and every type of filth. It is obvious that such a letter would never have been entertained by Hadhrat Husein ﷺ. The purpose of mentioning this alleged letter is merely to show that even their own sources, with all its lies, initially when discussing the letters they had sent to Hadhrat Husein ﷺ made no mention of Yazîd being an evil man, an adulterer, a drunkard, etc. The next portion of his letter makes this even clearer.) He continues:

At the present moment, we find ourselves with no leader. If you come over, it is hoped that through you, Almighty Allâh shall gather all of us under your banner, to fight for the truth. ***As for Nu'maan ibn Bashir ﷺ,***

---

[65] (بسم الله الرحمن الرحيم) لحسين بن على من سليمان بن صرد والمسيب بن نجبة ورفاعة ابن شداد وحبيب بن مظاهر وشيعته من المؤمنين والمسلمين من أهل الكوفة سلام عليك فإنا نحمد إليك الله الذى لا إله إلا هو أما بعد فالحمد لله الذى قصم عدوك الجبار العنيد الذى انتزى على هذه الامة فابتزها أمرها وغصبها فيأها وتأمر عليها بغير رضى منها ثم قتل خيارها واستبقى شرارها وجعل مال الله دولة بين جبابرتها وأغنيائها فبعدا له كما بعدت ثمود إنه ليس علينا إمام فأقبل لعل الله أن يجمعنا بك على الحق والنعمان بن بشير في قصر الامارة لسنا نجتمع معه في جمعة ولا نخرج معه إلى عيد ولو قد بلغنا أنك قد أقبلت إلينا أخرجناه حتى نلحقه بالشام إن شاء الله والسلام و رحمة الله عليك

<u>who at present occupies the seat of governing, we have nothing to do with him. We do not perform Jumu'ah behind him, nor do we go out with him for Eid. If the news reaches us that you are coming over, we shall immediately force him out and have him sent back to Shâm</u>, Insha-Allâh!

May Almighty Allâh's peace, mercy and blessings always be upon you!

Continuing with his preposterous narration[66], Abu Mikhnaf explains that this letter was then sent with Abdullâh ibn Saba' Al-Hamdaani, and Abdullâh ibn Waal. The letter was handed to Hadhrat Husein رضي الله عنه on the 10th of Ramadan, while he was in Makkah Mukarramah. Two days later, Qais ibn Mishar and a few others were sent with approximately thirty-five such letters, allegedly sent from individuals, as well as groups. Then Hani' ibn Hani' As-Subai'ee and Saeed ibn Abdullâh Al-Hanafi were sent with the following letter:

(بسم الله الرحمن الرحيم) لحسين بن على من شيعته من المؤمنين والمسلمين أما بعد فحيهلا فإن الناس ينتظرونك ولا رأى لهم في غيرك فالعجل العجل والسلام عليك

In the Name of Allâh, Most Kind and Merciful. To Husein ibn Ali from his believing supporters. Hasten over to us, for verily people are waiting anxiously for you, and they want none but you! Please Hasten! Please Hasten! And May Almighty Allâh's peace be with you!

Like this, numerous other letters (written by the same party and ascribed to various influential people) were sent to Hadhrat Husein رضي الله عنه, but in hardly any of these letters can mention be found that Yazîd had taken to drinking, adultery, etc. Rather, as mentioned in the first letter, these letters were in actual fact complaining of Hadhrat Nu'maan ibn

---

[66] ثم سرحنا بالكتاب مع عبد الله بن سبع الهمداني وعبد الله بن وال وأمرناهما بالنجاء فخرج الرجلان مسرعين حتى قدما على حسين لعشر مضين من شهر رمضان بمكة ثم لبثنا يومين ثم سرحنا إليه قيس بن مسهر الصيداوي وعبد الرحمن بن عبد الله بن الكدن الارحبي وعمارة بن عبيد السلولى فحملوا معهم نحوا من ثلاثة وخمسين صحيفة من الرجل والاثنين والاربعة قال ثم لبثنا يومين آخرين ثم سرحنا إليه هانئ بن هانئ السبيعى وسعيد بن عبد الله الحنفي وكتبنا معهما (بسم الله الرحمن الرحيم) لحسين بن على من شيعته من المؤمنين والمسلمين أما بعد فحيهلا فإن الناس ينتظرونك ولا رأى لهم في غيرك فالعجل العجل والسلام عليك وكتب شبث بن ربعى وحجار بن أبجر ويزيد بن الحارث ويزيد بن رويم وعزرة ابن قيس وعمرو بن الحجاج الزبيدى ومحمد بن عمير التميمي أما بعد فقد اخضر الجناب وأينعت الثمار وطمت الجمام فإذا شئت فاقدم على جند لك مجند والسلام عليك

Bashirﷺ, who was a high-ranking Sahâbiﷺ. As for Yazîd, who was far away in Shâm, had he been doing any such act, which history today attributes to him, at least one letter from Shâm should have come, or at least one complainant could have stood up in the Masjid of Rasulullâhﷺ, and spoken out against the so-called evil practices of Yazîd. The fact that this did not happen, and the fact that even the forged letters of Iraq made no mention of these acts lays ample indication to the fact that these accusations leveled against Yazîd were not even heard of during his reign, and that Hadhrat Huseinﷺ's going over to Iraq had nothing to do with the so-called evil character, ruthless behavior, immoral practices, etc, of Yazîd, which are today described as what is known as 'gospel-truth'.

In the same narration of Mikhnaf, mention has also been made of a letter written by Hadhrat Huseinﷺ to the people of Iraq, the contents of which were:

In the Name of Allâh, Most Kind and Most Merciful.
From Husein ibn Ali to the believing masses. Hani' ibn Hani' As-Subei'ee and Saeed ibn Abdullâh Al-Hanafi have presented your letters before me, and they are the last of the messengers that have come to me, with messages from your side. I have understood what you have said, the crux of which is that you have no leader, and desire that I come over, so that all may be united, under the banner of the truth, through me.

I have thus sent my brother, my cousin, a man from the Ahle-Bait, and one who I trust fully, i.e. Muslim ibn Aqeel, to investigate the truth behind your claims. If he informs me that the leaders, scholars, and masses have truly united in the decision to take me as their leader, as your letters have described, I shall waste no time in setting out to Iraq, since a true leader can only be he who himself practices on that which

is right and who rules with justice! And may Almighty Allâh's blessings be upon you![67]

4) When Hadhrat Husein ﵁ finally did intend setting out for Iraq, many influential men of Hijâz tried to dissuade him. Amongst these men, many were even illustrious Sahâbah ﵃. Had the purpose behind Hadhrat Husein ﵁'s setting out been that Yazîd was committing vile acts in the court of Caliphate, Hadhrat Husein ﵁ would surely have made mention of this in front of them, and would have in fact rebuked them for not joining his cause. Had Yazîd really been doing such actions, would it not then mean that at that moment the fervor to defend Islâm from all types of innovations and innovators had disappeared from practically the hearts of all the soldiers of Islâm, situated in Hijâz and Shâm, and now it was only some unknown people in Iraq who were left to defend Islâm from the rot which Yazîd was apparently causing. Could any sane mind ever accept such nonsense, that in the fear of Yazîd, the illustrious Sahâbah ﵃ and Tabi'ee of the blessed lands of Hijâz and Shâm all turned coward?! Nauuzubillah (May Allâh protect us from such filth)!

The fact of the matter is that, as mentioned above, Hadhrat Husein ﵁'s setting out for Iraq was never based upon any evil that Yazîd had began perpetrating, but rather on account of something completely different. The shaitaani world could not however allow this reason to become known to the masses, for if known, their entire emotional escapade would get watered down to a practical

[67] أما بعد فان هانئا وسعيدا قدما على بكتبكم وكانا آخر من قدم على من رسلكم وقد فهمت كل الذى اقتصصتم وذكرتم ومقالة جلكم إنه ليس علينا إمام فأقبل لعل الله أن يجمعنا بك على الهدى والحق وقد بعثت إليكم أخى وابن عمى وثقتى من أهل بيتى وأمرته أن يكتب إلى بحالكم وأمركم ورأيكم فان كتب إلى أنه قد أجمع رأى ملئكم وذوى الفضل والحجى منكم على مثل ما قدمت على به رسلكم وقرأت في كتبكم أقدم عليكم وشيكا إن شاء الله فلعمري ما الامام إلا العامل بالكتاب والآخذ بالقسط والدائن بالحق والحابس نفسه على ذات الله والسلام (الطبري)

zero, and the chance of spurring the masses against the Ummayyad Empire would never be acquired.

In the next few pages, a detailed explanation shall, Insha-Allâh, be given, highlighting the true reason behind Hadhrat Husein رضي الله عنه refusing to pledge allegiance to Yazîd, the reason behind his setting out for Iraq, and the reason why all the soldiers of Islâm, scattered throughout the Muslim world, did not accompany him on his journey.

Fighting for the Caliphate, an issue of Ijtihâd

A deeper study of historical narrations shall clearly show that Hadhrat Husein رضي الله عنه's displeasure with the Ummayyad government was not born in the era of Yazîd, but rather from the very beginning, when his brother, Hadhrat Hasan رضي الله عنه, decided to hand over the Caliphate to Hadhrat Muawiyah رضي الله عنه.

As mentioned earlier, the issue of handing over the caliphate was one of Ijtihâd. Hadhrat Hasan رضي الله عنه understood well that, as the Ahâdith had predicted, the issue of caliphate would no longer be judged solely on the basis of mutual consultation (mashwera), but rather wars would now decide who the next caliph would be.

Fighting for the caliphate was no sin, but Hadhrat Hasan رضي الله عنه did not want to see any more blood spilled over this issue. He رضي الله عنه thus decided to hand over the caliphate to Hadhrat Muawiyah رضي الله عنه, and through this action of his, the in-fighting amongst the Muslims came to an abrupt halt. Had Hadhrat Hasan رضي الله عنه wished, he could also have fought for the caliphate, and this was exactly what many hypocrite fractions of Iraq were desirous of seeing.

Fighting for the caliphate would have also been a meritorious deed, since when one makes Ijtihâd, Almighty Allâh has promised that

reward shall be given upon his effort, and not in accordance to whether the decision was the best for that moment or not.

The Ijtihâd of Hadhrat Muawiyahؓ on the other hand was that as long as the caliphate remained in Iraq, the hypocrites of that area would continue utilizing their influence in stirring trouble, chaos and anarchy throughout the Muslim World. Hadhrat Muawiyahؓ's view was that if the caliphate moves over to Shâm, such an act would greatly weaken the plots of the shaitaani elements who had already spread throughout the Islâmic Lands, but whose base had always been Iraq.

In the twenty years of peace and stability that thereafter followed, ample evidence was provided to show that Hadhrat Hasanؓ's decision to hand over the caliphate was indeed one of great wisdom and practicality, and at the same time, the decision of Hadhrat Muawiyahؓ to be prepared to fight for the caliphate, that decision too was straight on target.

Hadhrat Huseinؓ, on the other hand, from the very beginning, held onto the view upon which he had found his illustrious father, Hadhrat Aliؓ, i.e. to keep the seat of the caliphate in Kufa. When Hadhrat Huseinؓ came to know of his brother's intention to hand over the caliphate, he clearly made known to his brother his feelings. The books of history provide numerous statements of hisؓ, in which heؓ expressed his unhappiness with regards to the decision taken. The following passage of Al-Bidâyah highlights this point most clearly[68]:

---

[68] فلما آلت الخلافة إلى أخيه وأراد أن يصالح شق ذلك عليه ولم يسدد رأي أخيه في ذلك، بل حثه على قتل أهل الشام، فقال له أخوه: والله لقد هممت أن أسجنك في بيت وأطبق عليك بابه حتى أفرغ من هذا الشأن ثم أخرجك. فلما رأى الحسين ذلك سكت وسلم، فلما استقرت الخلافة لمعاوية كان الحسين يتردد إليه مع أخيه الحسن فيكرمهما معاوية إكراما زائدا، ويقول لهما: مرحبا وأهلا، ويعطيهما عطاء جزيلا، وقد أطلق لهما في يوم واحد مائتي ألف، وقال: خذاها وأنا ابن هند، والله لا يعطيكماها أحد

When Hadhrat Hasan ﷺ intended handing over the caliphate to Hadhrat Muawiyah ﷺ, through a peace treaty, ***Hadhrat Husein ﷺ disapproved the decision, and insisted instead that the war against the people of Shâm continue****. Hadhrat Hasan ﷺ finally threatened to have him placed under house arrest until the peace-treaty gets finalized. Realizing his brother's determination to proceed ahead with the treaty, Hadhrat Husein ﷺ fell silent and accepted.*

Afterwards, Hadhrat Husein ﷺ would accompany his brother, Hadhrat Hasan ﷺ, on his regular visits to Hadhrat Muawiyah ﷺ, during which Hadhrat Muawiyah ﷺ would honour them greatly, and shower them with gifts.

Even after the death of Hadhrat Hasan ﷺ, Hadhrat Husein ﷺ would continue paying regular visits to Hadhrat Muawiyah ﷺ, and would receive the same honour as before. In fact, Hadhrat Husein ﷺ even participated in the battle of Constantinople, ***fighting under the leadership of Yazîd ibn Muawiyah****, which occurred in the 51st year of Hijrah!*

SubhanAllâh! This was the superb nature of the Sahâbah ﷺ, that despite not agreeing with the decisions of their leaders, once the decision would be passed, they would forget all their personal views and remain united under one banner. Hadhrat Husein ﷺ was, from the very beginning, not at all in favour of seeing the caliphate being placed in the hands of Hadhrat Muawiyah ﷺ, but once he pledged his allegiance to Hadhrat Muawiyah ﷺ, he would never be prepared to pull his hand out.

The following passage of Al-Bidâyah is clear proof of this:

قبلي ولا بعدي، فقال الحسين: والله لن تعطي أنت ولا أحد قبلك ولا بعدك رجلا منا. ولما توفي الحسن كان الحسين يفد إلى معاوية في كل عام فيعطيه ويكرمه، وقد كان في الجيش الذين غزوا القسطنطينية مع ابن معاوية يزيد، في سنة إحدى وخمسين

After the death of Hadhrat Hasan﵁, Musayyib ibn Utbah Al-Fazari, together with a group of Iraqis, came to Hadhrat Husein﵁ and begged him to break his allegiance to Hadhrat Muâwiyah﵁, and accept their allegiance to him, saying,

'We are well aware of your opinion in the matter regarding Muâwiyah, (referring to the fact that Hadhrat Husein﵁ was, from the very beginning not happy with the decision to hand over the caliphate).

*Hadhrat Husein﵁ replied, '**I have hope that Almighty Allâh reward my brother for his good intentions (i.e. to refrain from fighting, and thus save the blood of the Ummah), and I hope that he rewards me for my good intentions (i.e. the love of fighting against the oppressors)**.*[69]

When the governor of Madinah Al Munawwara, Marwan ibn Al-Hakam, received news of these delegations, he had a message sent to Hadhrat Muâwiyah﵁, saying, "I fear that Husein﵁ shall become a target of fitnah(turmoil)!" Hadhrat Muâwiyah﵁ thus wrote to Hadhrat Husein﵁, cautioning him from falling into the trap of the Iraqis. His advice was as follows:

'Remember, it is only appropriate that the one who makes a pledge to a caliph now fulfils his pledge!" I have been informed that some people of Kufa have requested that you join them in breaking the unity. I am sure that through past experience you now realise that the people of Kufa can never be trusted. They have already betrayed your father and your brother. Thus, fear Almighty Allâh and remember your pledge. If you attempt to plot against me, I shall punish you severely!"

Hadhrat Husein﵁ replied to this letter, saying,

---

[69] **قدم المسيب بن عتبة الفزاري في عدة معه إلى الحسين بعد وفاة الحسن، فدعوه إلى خلع معاوية وقالوا: قد علمنا رأيك ورأي أخيك، فقال: إني لارجو أن يعطى الله أخي على نيته في حبه الكف، وأن يعطيني على نيتي في حبي جهاد الظالمين (البداية)**

'I have no intention of doing that which you suspect. And Almighty Allâh alone guides towards good. I have no intention to fight against you, but at the same time I fear that if Almighty Allâh has to ask as to why I abandoned Jihad against you, I shall have no answer!'[70]

In Al-Akhbar Al-Tiwaal, Hafiz Deenawari has quoted the following[71], which explicitly shows that some people of Iraq were continuously on the lookout for some excuse to reignite the flames of disunity amongst the believers, but due to the respect Hadhrat Husein رضي الله عنه held for the institution of allegiance, he was not at all prepared to lead any rebellion at that moment:

When the news of the death of Hadhrat Hasan رضي الله عنه reached the people of Kufa, the leaders of Kufa sent their condolences to Hadhrat Husein رضي الله عنه, via letters. Ja'dah ibn Hubeira, who would display the most love for the Ahle-Bait, wrote,

'Such friends of yours are present here (i.e. in Kufa and Iraq), who are eagerly awaiting your coming, who regard none as your equal! They are well aware that the opinion of your brother, Hasan, was to avoid

[70] وكتب مروان إلى معاوية: إني لست آمن أن يكون حسين مرصدا للفتنة، وأظن يومكم من حسين طويلا. فكتب معاوية إلى الحسين: إن من أعطى الله صفقة يمينه وعهده لجدير بالوفاء، وقد أنبئت أن قوما من أهل الكوفة قد دعوك إلى الشقاق، وأهل العراق من قد جربت قد أفسدوا على أبيك وأخيك، فاتق الله واذكر الميثاق، فإنك متى تكدني أكدك. فكتب إليه الحسين: أتاني كتابك وأنا بغير الذي بلغك عني جدير، والحسنات لا يهدي لها إلا الله، وما أردت لك محاربة ولا عليك خلافا، وما أظن لي عند الله عذرا في ترك جهادك (البداية)

[71] وبلغ أهل الكوفة وفاة الحسن، فاجتمع عظماؤهم فكتبوا إلى الحسين رضي الله عنه يعزونه. وكتب إليه جعدة بن هبيرة بن أبي وهب، وكان أمحضهم حبا ومودة: (أما بعد، فإن من قبلنا من شيعتك متطلعة أنفسهم إليك، لا يعدلون بك أحدا، وقد كانوا عرفوا رأي الحسن أخيك في دفع الحرب، وعرفوك باللين لأوليائك، والغلظة على أعدائك، والشدة في أمر الله، فإن كنت تحب أن تطلب هذا الأمر فاقدم علينا، فقد وطنا أنفسنا على الموت معك) فكتب إليهم: (أما أخي فأرجو أن يكون الله قد وفقه، وسدده فيما يأتي، وأما أنا فليس رأيي اليوم ذلك، فالصقوا رحمكم الله بالأرض، وأكمنوا في البيوت، واحترسوا من الظنة ما دام معاوية حيا، فان يحدث الله به حدثا وأنا حي، كتبت إليكم برأيي والسلام) (الاخبار الطوال للدينوري)

war, whereas you are a man who shows kindness to friends and severity against the enemy, a man who fights bravely for the Deen of Allâh. Thus, if you are desirous of achieving these goals, come over to Kufa immediately, for we have, in your service, handed ourselves over to death!

Hadhrat Husain ﷺ answered as follows:

'I have hope that Almighty Allâh treats my brother favourably. ***As for me, at the present moment, I do not feel rebellion to be appropriate.*** *Thus, as long as Muawiyah remains alive, remain in Kufa, seek shelter in your homes, and avoid becoming targets of suspicion. If something happens to him (i.e. he passes away) whilst I am still alive, I shall write to you again, informing you of my intentions*

Hadhrat Husein ﷺ, in the company of his elder brother, Hadhrat Hasan ﷺ, had pledged allegiance to Hadhrat Muawiyah ﷺ, and no matter what his personal feelings were, he understood very well that breaking allegiance was abhorred by the Shariah. As long as Hadhrat Muawiyah ﷺ remained alive, Hadhrat Husein ﷺ remained loyal to the demands of his allegiance. When Hadhrat Muawiyah ﷺ made known his plan to have his son, Yazîd, elected as the next caliph, Hadhrat Husein ﷺ was amongst those in Hijaaz who refused to accept this proposal. Such a proposal, despite it being made by a caliph, does not hold the status of a binding law of the Shariah, and thus those who did oppose the proposal were at full liberty to do so. By not pledging allegiance to Yazîd, Hadhrat Husein ﷺ kept open for himself a door, through which, if he ever decided, he could once again stand up to fight for the caliphate, and bring it back into the hands of the Banu Hashim. This decision of Hadhrat Husein ﷺ was one of Ijtihâd, and as with every mujtahid, he was at full liberty to practice upon the dictates of his Ijtihâd.

Based upon the contents of the letters of Iraq, Hadhrat Huseinرضي الله عنه understood that there were many fractions in Iraq and its surrounding areas, who had either not yet pledged allegiance to Yazîd, or had been forced into doing so, and that these people were eagerly awaiting his return to Kufa, so that they could happily pledge their allegiance to him. As Hadhrat Muawiyahرضي الله عنه had once upon a time been prepared to fight for the caliphate, Hadhrat Huseinرضي الله عنه now also had every right to do the same.

The vast majority of the inhabitants of Hijaaz however were not fully in favour of this decision of Hadhrat Huseinرضي الله عنه, with many basing their opinion upon the fact that the letters and letter-bearers from Iraq had shown time and again, from the era of Hadhrat Uthmaanرضي الله عنه till the present day, that they should never be trusted. These inhabitants had no problem with Hadhrat Huseinرضي الله عنه standing up to fight for the caliphate, since they understood well that this was an issue of Ijtihâd, wherein each mujtahid is free to practice upon his opinion. Their only worry was that it should not be that Hadhrat Huseinرضي الله عنه becomes bait for the liars of Iraq, who would merely be using him to re-ignite the flames of war within the Muslim world.

It was for this very reason that some requested that he first send someone to investigate the reality on the ground in Iraq, others pleaded that he choose any other direction but that of Kufa, and there were even those who advised him against heading for any major city, but rather to move through villages and slowly gather around him an army of loyal followers.

Below shall follow some passages from the books of history, which if read with an unbiased and open heart, one shall, Insha-Allâh, surely see the truth of much of what has just been mentioned:

a) Mohammad ibn Al-Hanafiyah was the son of Hadhrat Ali‎ؓ, and the consanguine brother of Hadhrat Hasanؓ and Hadhrat Huseinؓ. The love and honour that he held for his brothers was of an immense nature, which would make him say that even his own children do not occupy that spot in his heart which Hadhrat Hasanؓ and Hadhrat Huseinؓ would occupy. Despite being younger, due to his bodily and mental strength, Hadhrat Aliؓ would constantly remind him to keep a watchful eye over Hadhrat Hasanؓ and Hadhrat Huseinؓ, due to which, during battles, he would mostly be found in close proximity to them.

When the news of Hadhrat Huseinؓ intending to set out reached him, he, after failing to dissuade Hadhrat Huseinؓ from leaving Madinah Munawwara, offered the advice mentioned below, and ended with the plea that if Hadhrat Huseinؓ had to leave, he should rather go over to Makkah Mukarramah, and from there give the matter second thought:

O my Brother, You are indeed the most beloved to me, as well as the most honoured, thus I shall spare no effort in rendering the most sincere of advices. Avoid open confrontation with Yazîd ibn Muawiyah and stay away from major cities as far as possible. Staying away from major areas, send your messengers to the people and ***invite them to pledge allegiance to you. If they pledge allegiance, praise Almighty Allâh and accept. However, if they prefer someone over you****, that shall not harm your religion nor your intelligence, and neither shall it cause any deficiency in your honour and status.*

I fear that if you enter any major city, and due to your arriving, war breaks out between two parties, i.e. the party supporting you against

the party supporting the opposition, I fear that you may perhaps be the first to be shot down, and thereby the blood of the best of this world, at the present moment, shall get spilled in a ruthless manner.[72]

(In the above advice can one find any sort of indication that the setting out of Hadhrat Husein ﷺ was due to some sort of oppression and evil that Yazîd was perpetrating, or rather does the above words indicate towards something completely different, i.e. to return the caliphate back to the Banu Hashim, which was purely an Ijtihâdi issue.

Had the campaign been to rid the world of Yazîd's so-called oppression and evil, Hadhrat Mohammad ibn Al-Hanafiyah ﷺ would never have dissuaded Hadhrat Husein ﷺ from proceeding forth, rather he would have been the first to join the campaign.

Due to the issue having nothing to do with any oppression and evil of Yazîd, but rather with the issue of fighting for the caliphate, and due to Hadhrat Mohammad ibn Al-Hanafiyah ﷺ, in this matter, agreeing more with the reasoning of Hadhrat Hasan ﷺ, i.e. to leave the caliphate to others and not to ever fight for it; he not only refrained from joining the caravan of Hadhrat Husein ﷺ, but in fact even prohibited his own children from participating in the expedition.[73])

---

[72] يا أخي أنت أحب الناس إلي وأعزهم علي ولست أدخر النصيحة لاحد من الخلق أحق بها منك تنح بتبعتك عن يزيد ابن معاوية وعن الامصار ما استطعت ثم ابعث رسلك إلى الناس فادعهم إلى نفسك فان بايعوا لك حمدت الله على ذلك وإن أجمع الناس على غيرك لم ينقص الله بذلك دينك ولا عقلك ولا يذهب به مروءتك ولا فضلك إني أخاف أن تدخل مصرا من هذه الامصار وتأتي جماعة من الناس فيختلفون بينهم فمنهم طائفة معك وأخرى عليك فيقتتلون فتكون لاول الاسنة فإذا خير هذه الامة كلها نفسا وأبا وأما أضيعها دما وأذلها أهلا (انساب الاشراف)

[73] فأدرك حسينا بمكة فأعلمه أن الخروج ليس له برأي يومه هذا، فأبى الحسين أن يقبل، فحبس محمد بن الحنفية ولده فلم يبعث أحدا منهم حتى وجد الحسين في نفسه على محمد، وقال: ترغب بولدك عن موضع أصاب فيه ؟ فقال: وما حاجتي إلى أن تصاب ويصابون معك ؟ وإن كانت مصيبتك أعظم عندنا منهم (البداية)

b) Hadhrat Abdullâh ibn Umarﷺ, whose name had been taken many a time as a possible candidate for the caliphate, whose position during the years of internal conflict had always been neutral, and who had initially also refused to pledge allegiance to Yazîd, heﷺ too, after finding that the Ummah has practically united upon Yazîd, not only pledges allegiance, but in fact even invites Hadhrat Huseinﷺ and Hadhrat Abdullâh ibn Zubeirﷺ to refrain from standing up against the government. An extract of the advice offered by Hadhrat Abdullâh ibn Umarﷺ, as quoted in Al-Bidâyah is as follows:

أذكركما الله إلا رجعتما فدخلتما في صالح ما يدخل فيه الناس، وتنظرا فإن اجتمع الناس عليه فلم تشذا، وإن افترقوا عليه كان الذي تريدان

I beg you in the name of Allâh to return to Madinah, and to again ponder over this matter. If you find the people have accepted Yazîd, then do not be the ones who remain aloof.

And if the people themselves pull away from him, then that is exactly what you desire.

Hadhrat Abdullâh ibn Umarﷺ would thereafter say

غلبنا حسين بن علي بالخروج، ولعمري لقد رأى في أبيه وأخيه عبرة، فرأى من الفتنة وخذلان الناس لهما ما كان ينبغي له أن لا يتحرك ما عاش،

وأن يدخل في صالح ما دخل فيه الناس، فإن الجماعة خير(البداية)

"We were unable to dissuade Husein ibn Aliﷺ from his intention to stand against the government, whereas heﷺ himself had seen in the life of his father and brother, and in the strife that existed during that period, and in how the people (of Iraq) had deserted them, in all of this he had surely seen such lessons which should have been sufficient to hold him back from standing against the government, and making him accept what the majority had accepted. And in unity there is plenty of good!

c) Hadhrat Abdullâh ibn Abbaas, upon being informed that Hadhrat Husein was planning to go over to Iraq, made the following plea to Hadhrat Husein:

إنى لكاره لوجهك هذا تخرج إلى قوم قتلوا أباك وطعنوا أخاك حتى تركهم سخطة وملالة لهم أذكرك الله أن تغزر بنفسك (البداية)

I am not happy with the direction you have chosen to take. You are heading to the very people who had killed your father and slandered your brother, until finally he left angry and tired of their disloyalty. *I ask you in the name of Allâh that you do not go!*

d) Hadhrat Abu Saeed Al-Khudri, describing his efforts in trying to change the mind of Hadhrat Husein, is quoted as having said:

غلبنى الحسين على الخروج وقلت له اتق الله فى نفسك والزم بيتك ولا تخرج على إمامك

I failed in dissuading Husein from standing up against the government. I pleaded with him, saying, ' Fear Allâh, with regards to your life, do not leave your house, and do not stand up against your Imaam (leader)!'

e) Hadhrat Abu Waqid Al-Laithi narrates[74] that when the news of Hadhrat Husein ibn Ali leaving for Iraq reached him, he implored him not to go, saying that the direction he had chosen was leading to nowhere but his death.'

f) Hadhrat Jaabir ibn Abdullâh is quoted as having said to Hadhrat Husein on this occasion:

---

[74] **بلغنى خروج الحسين بن على فأدركته بملل فناشدته الله أن لا يخرج فانه يخرج فى غير وجه الخروج إنما خرج يقتل نفسه (البداية)**

اتق الله ولا تضرب الناس بعضهم ببعض (البداية)

Fear Allâh and do not become the cause of infighting amongst the believers!

g) Hadhrat Saeed ibn Al-Musayyib (the most senior of the Tâbi'een) is quoted as having said:

لو أن حسينا لم يخرج لكان خيرا له (البداية)

Had Husein never left for Iraq, it would have been much better for him!

h) Hadhrat Miswar ibn Makhramah wrote to Hadhrat Husein, and warned him not to be fooled with the letters of the people of Iraq[75]

i) Hadhrat Abdullâh ibn Abbaas offered the following advice to Hadhrat Husein:

لا تبرح الحرم فانهم إن كانت بهم إليك حاجة فسيضربون إليك أباط الابل حتى يوافوك فتخرج فى قوة وعدة (البداية)

Do not leave the Haram! If the people of Iraq are truthful in their claims, they will themselves come on the backs of their camels to find you, after which you may set out with a huge powerful army!

j) Hadhrat Amrah bint Abdur Rahmaan (the grand- daughter of Hadhrat Sa'd ibn Zuraarah) wrote to Hadhrat Husein, emphasizing upon him to accept the new government and keep the unity. She also mentioned that if he had to leave for Iraq, he would only be dragging himself towards his place of slaughter, since she had clearly heard from Hadhrat

[75] وكتب إليه المسور بن مخرمة إياك أن تغتر بكتب أهل العراق ويقول ابن الزبير الحق بهم فانهم ناصروك (البداية)

Ayesha that Rasulullâh had made mention of Baabil (Babylon – city of Iraq) being the place at which Hadhrat Husein would be killed.[76]

k) Abu Bakr ibn Abdur Rahmaan ibn Haarith ibn Hishâm, (one of the famous seven Fuqahah of Madinah Munawwara), while pleading with Hadhrat Husein to abandon his idea of proceeding towards Iraq, made the following remark, which if one ponders deeply over the secret realities behind Karbala, shall find to be one hundred percent on target. He said:

يا ابن عم قد رأيت ما صنع أهل العراق بأبيك وأخيك وأنت تريد أن تسير إليهم وهم عبيد الدنيا فيقاتلك من قد وعدك أن ينصرك ويخذلك من أنت أحب إليه ممن ينصره (البداية)

O my cousin, after having seen what the people of Iraq had done to your father and brother, how can you ever think of going back to them, whereas they are nothing but slaves of this world.
If you do proceed, it may well result in those very people fighting against you who are at present inviting you. Then those who truly love you shall be unable to assist you!

l) Hadhrat Abdullâh ibn Ja'far (the son of Hadhrat Ja'far Tayyaar) wrote to Hadhrat Husein warning him of the people of Iraq and begging him, in the name of Allâh, not to proceed towards them.[77]

Despite the above mentioned pleas, as well as many others, from influential and prominent individuals of Makkah Mukarramah and

[76] وكتبت إليه عمرة بنت عبد الرحمن تعظم عليه ما يريد أن يصنع وتأمره بالطاعة ولزوم الجماعة وتخبره أنه إن لم يفعل إنما يساق إلى مصرعه وتقول أشهد لسمعت عائشة تقول إنها سمعت رسول الله ص يقول يقتل الحسين بأرض بابل (البداية)

[77] وكتب إليه عبد الله بن جعفر كتابا يحذره اهل العراق ويناشده الله ان شخص إليهم (البداية)

Madinah Munawwara, Hadhrat Husein remained determined to proceed towards Iraq, perhaps on account of a dream in which he had seen his beloved grandfather, Rasulullâh, making some indication towards him, the details of which he felt best not to disclose to anyone.[78]

Whatever the case may be, Hadhrat Husein had his reasons for proceeding towards Iraq, despite receiving so much of advice not to do so, and none could ever dare question his reasons. However, the above mentioned twelve advices, rendered by the prominent Sahâbah and Tâbi'een of his time, and their disapproving with his decision, that should surely cause a bell of doubt to ring against the story of Karbala that is popularly known.

Had Hadhrat Husein's setting out been to fight against some oppression, evil and corruption of Yazîd, could one ever fathom such luminaries discouraging him from doing so?! Could it ever be possible, that after having placed their lives on the line in the defence of Islâm on numerous occasions, these luminaries now, in the face of Yazîd, turn coward?!

Had Yazîd been drinking and committing open adultery, would Hadhrat Husein not have rebuked at least one of these personalities, that despite knowing of vice being committed openly in the court of the caliphate, they are not only lagging behind, but in fact attempting to prevent him from standing against falsehood?! Forget rebuking, in not one of these narrations can any mention whatsoever be found of

[78] فكتب إليه الحسين إنى رأيت رؤيا ورأيت رسول الله ﷺ أمرنى بامر وأنا ماض له ولست بمخبر بها أحدا حتى ألاقى عملى (البداية)

Hadhrat Husein mentioning the evil, drinking, adultery, etc. of Yazîd as the reason behind his setting out. Why?!

If, in the story of Karbala that is normally known, one finds himself unable to answer the above, then it shall only be fair that one now extends a just and unbiased ear, eye and heart in search of some sort of explanation that could answer the above.

One such explanation, which could provide answers to many unexplainable issues, is the one that has been rendered from the very beginning of this book, i.e. Hadhrat Husein had no personal issue with Yazîd, nor was there any issue of Yazîd drinking, committing adultery, etc, but rather Hadhrat Husein's leaving for Iraq was so that he could find an army prepared to stand with him in his fight to take back the caliphate, an act which was totally permissible and being based on Ijtihâd, would in fact be rewardable. This and this alone, in my opinion, was the reason that Hadhrat Husein set forward for Iraq, and in my understanding, it is only this explanation which can provide answers as to why Hadhrat Husein was left alone in his fight against Yazîd, and why the vast majority of the inhabitants of Makkah Mukarramah and Madinah Munawwara, as well as all the pious of Iraq, Shâm, etc, abstained from joining the expedition of Hadhrat Husein.

Muslim ibn Aqeel and the betrayal by the hypocrites of Iraq

After being warned numerous times of the common treacherous practices that the people of Iraq were famous for, Hadhrat Husein decided to tread with slightly greater caution. For this, he requested his cousin, Muslim ibn Aqeel, to proceed ahead and send a report back

on whether the facts on the ground conformed to the letters he had been receiving.

Had Muslim ibn Aqeel been sent in secrecy, without the hypocrites of Iraq being made aware of his coming, he most probably would have seen a completely different picture, just as how the investigators, sent in the era of Hadhrat Umar﵁ and Hadhrat Uthmaan﵁ to investigate complaints being made against governors, found that the accusations had practically no weight whatsoever.

Destiny however rules, thus the news of Muslim ibn Aqeel's coming was conveyed to the parties whose letters were continuously pouring in.

The hypocrites of Iraq wasted no time, and as reports suggest, hundreds were prepared to welcome Muslim ibn Aqeel﵁ into Iraq. The figure of ten to twenty thousand does seem exaggerated, but whatever the matter is, the numbers that met him on his arrival were definitely huge, which spurred him to immediately write to Hadhrat Husein﵁, and give the glad tidings that the matter in Iraq is fully stable, and the people are in eager anticipation of Hadhrat Husein﵁'s coming.

If one were to ponder slightly over the recorded events regarding Muslim ibn Aqeel﵁, from the time he arrived in Iraq until his death, one would surely notice many such points that indicate towards some sort of conspiracy, in which Hadhrat Husein﵁ was being called towards Iraq solely so that his innocent blood could be later used for nefarious purposes. Amongst these many points, one that I feel deserves the most attention is with regards to the identity of the ones who were begging Hadhrat Husein﵁ to come over to Iraq.

If these men can be identified, and a glimpse into their life-history be made, I am certain that that itself would be sufficient in exposing the lies and conspiracies behind Karbala. A glimpse at their lives would clearly show that, from the very beginning, they had no good intentions. Rather, if one were to say that many were nothing but satanists, that too would not be far-fetched. Quoting from the books of history, some aspects of these individuals shall now be put forward, whereby one could get a good picture regarding those who were behind Hadhrat Husein's coming to Iraq. If the intention and character of these inviters turn out evil, it would then only be fair that one accept that perhaps the complaints and calls made to Husein, which finally resulted in him going over to Iraq, all these calls and complaints were nothing but open lies!

From the names that have been recorded, who were in the forefront of bringing Hadhrat Husein over to Iraq, one individual stands out most vividly, an individual whose every act shows that he was totally under the influence of shaitân, an individual who would be the first to lay a claim of being appointed by Al-Mahdi, thereafter to advance to the claim of being a Nabi, and finally to take the step of declaring himself as The Almighty incarnated! (Nauuzubillah) The individual I am referring to here is the one whom the Ummah would later, in the light of the Sunnah and the disgusting deeds of this man, declare him as 'الدجال الكذاب' (i.e. one of the biggest liars in this Ummah). This liar was none other than Mukhtaar ibn Abu Ubeid Thaqafi. (May Almighty Allâh deal with him as he deserves).

When Hadhrat Muslim ibn Aqeel reached Iraq, to ascertain whether the invitation to Iraq could be trusted, it was this very Mukhtaar ibn Ubeid Thaqafi who hosted him and arranged meetings between him

and the ‘loyal’ supporters of Hadhrat Husein﵁. Finding the numbers of supporters to be adequate, Hadhrat Muslim ibn Aqeel﵁ sends out a letter to Hadhrat Husein﵁, informing him﵁ that Iraq does indeed have many supporters, eagerly awaiting his﵁ arrival. As soon as the letter leaves, Muslim ibn Aqeel﵁ finds that the attitude of Mukhtaar towards him has changed altogether. Hadhrat Muslim﵁ finally decides to leave the house of Mukhtaar, and finds himself completely deserted.

Mukhtaar ibn Ubeid thereafter practically disappears completely from the scene, and resurfaces only after the death of Hadhrat Husein﵁, screaming for revenge for the Ahle-Bait. The question that the common Karbala story fails to answer is that if Mukhtaar really had so much of love for the Ahle-Bait, why did he have Muslim ibn Aqeel﵁ thrown into the streets?!

To answer this question, it is vital that a glimpse into the life of this ‘open liar’ be made, which shall now, Insha-Allâh, follow...

Mukhtaar ibn Abu Ubeid Al-Thaqafi
(a dajjâl (open liar) of this Ummah)

Mukhtâr’s father, Abu Ubeid Thaqafi﵁ was a great Sahâbi﵁ of Rasulullâh﵁, who enjoyed the privilege of being the first leader to be sent by Hadhrat Umar﵁ in the Muslim campaign against Kufa. From the children of Hadhrat Abu Ubeid Thaqafi﵁, two stood out in history, one reaching a height in piety and the other falling to the pits of disgrace, viz. his daughter Safiyah, who was amongst the most prominent and righteous women of the Tâbi’een, especially noted for her position as the honourable wife of Hadhrat Abdullâh ibn Umar﵁, while on the other extreme was his infamous son, Mukhtaar, who in most probability, died in a state of kufr.

Mukhtaar, despite being born in the first year after the Hijrah, was not blessed with the companionship of Rasulullâhﷺ[79]. During his initial years, he displayed great qualities of virtue, knowledge and piety, but time would show that this was purely an outward show, as was the case with all the senior hypocrites of Iraq, who would display great humility and piety in front of the leaders of the Tâbi'een, solely so that their prominence could one day aid them in spreading their evil amongst the ignorant masses.

After the death of his honourable father, Mukhtaar was placed under the care of his uncle, Sa'd ibn Masood, who was amongst the trusted aides of Hadhrat Aliرضي الله عنه.

From the very beginning, Mukhtaar could be found playing a game of switching camps, solely to benefit his own whims and fancies. Initially he served under the authority of Hadhrat Aliرضي الله عنه, rarely showing signs of enmity, until one day, when words of extreme hatred for Hadhrat Hasanرضي الله عنه slipped from his tongue, due to which he became known as a khaariji.

After the death of Hadhrat Muawiyahرضي الله عنه however, he again stands in the frontline of the lovers of the Ahle-Bait, being amongst those inviting Hadhrat Huseinرضي الله عنه over to Iraq. His enmity for the Ahle-Bait again displays itself when he abandons Hadhrat Muslim ibn Aqeelرضي الله عنه, at the most crucial of moments, but shortly thereafter he is found raising the call of 'revenge for the Ahle-Bait', displaying his 'most sincere' love for the Ahle-Bait and open hatred for the entire Banu Ummayyah, irrespective of whether they physically participated in Karbalâ or not.

---

[79] **عمدة القاري**

Mukhtâr’s chameleon colours also got displayed when he pledged allegiance to Hadhrat Abdullâh ibn Zubeirﷺ in Makkah Mukarramah, after the death of Hadhrat Huseinﷺ, but upon his immediate return to Kufa, broke his allegiance and instead initiated his own campaign, inviting towards Muhammad ibn Hanafiyah, (the son of Hadhrat Aliﷺ), claiming him to not only be the caliph, but in fact, the awaited ‘Mahdi’, a claim which Muhammad ibn Hanafiyah rejected openly, yet his rejection fell upon the deaf ears of the people of Kufa, who would simply claim that Muhammad ibn Hanafiyah is practicing upon taqiyyah, i.e. concealing the truth, in the fear of the present Ummayyad government.

During the era of Hadhrat Aliﷺ, on one occasion, Mukhtaar presented fifteen dirhams in front of Hadhrat Aliﷺ, on behalf of his uncle. After putting the money down, he commented, ‘These coins are from the fares of prostitutes!’ Hadhrat Aliﷺ, shocked at his audacity, exclaimed, “May you be destroyed! What do I have to do with prostitutes?” Thereafter, when Mukhtaar stood up to leave, Hadhrat Aliﷺ noticed that he was wearing a red jubbah (cloak). Hadhrat Aliﷺ, upset with his dressing, remarked, **“What is wrong with this man? May Almighty Allâh destroy him! If his heart had to be opened, I am certain you would find it full of the love of Laat and Uzzah (two famous idols)**[80]

During the short rule of Hadhrat Hasanﷺ, an incident occurred, which is more than sufficient to display the hatred this hypocrite, Mukhtaar,

---

80 المختار ابن أبي عبيد مسعود بن عمرو الثقفي الكذاب الأمير، فقال أبو عوانة عن مغيرة، عن ثابت بن هرمز، قال: حمل المختار مالاً من المدائن من عند عمّه إلى علي، فأخرج خمسة عشر درهماً، وقال: هذا من المومسات، فقال: (مالي –ويلك– والمومسات؟ قال: ثم قام وعليه مُقَطَّعة له حمراء، فقال علي: ماله قاتله الله، لو شق عن قلبه لوجد ملآن من حب اللات والعزى. (المقتنى في سرد الكنى للذهبي – المصدر)

bore for the Ahle-Bait. Tabari has recorded this incident in the following words[81]:

When Hadhrat Hasanؓ reached Madaain, Mukhtaar indicated to his uncle, Sa'd ibn Masood, who was the governor over Madaain, that if he desired wealth and honour, he should have Hadhrat Hasanؓ arrested, and through it acquire a guarantee of protection from Hadhrat Muâwiyahؓ. His uncle, Sa'd, disgusted at his intention, replied in astonishment, 'May the curse of Almighty Allâh be upon you! Do you expect me to lay ambush to the grandson of Rasulullâhﷺ? You are indeed a most wretched man!

When this was the condition of Mukhtaar, during the era of Hadhrat Aliؓ and Hadhrat Hasanؓ, what then made him change his opinion and attitude with regards to the Ahle-Bait, just a few months after, that he now becomes ready to sacrifice his own life, just so that Hadhrat Huseinؓ could become caliph? Had Mukhtaar thereafter remained loyal till the end, one could perhaps have given him the benefit of the doubt that his repentance was sincere, whereas this was not the case. No sooner did Muslim ibn Aqeelؓ have his letter of assurance sent out to Hadhrat Huseinؓ, almost immediately the loving attitude of Mukhtaar changes, and Muslim ibn Aqeelؓ, for some unmentioned reason, finds himself on the streets, searching for accommodation. Mukhtaar thereafter disappears from the scenes, leaving Muslim ibn Aqeelؓ abandoned to be killed, without making even a single cry in opposition.

---

81 وخرج الحسن حتى نزل المقصورة البيضاء بالمدائن وكان عم المختار بن أبى عبيد عاملا على المدائن وكان اسمه سعد بن مسعود فقال له المختار وهو غلام شاب هل لك في الغنى والشرف قال وما ذاك قال توثق الحسن وتستأمن به إلى معاوية فقال له سعد عليك لعنة الله أثب على ابن بنت رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم فأوثقه بئس الرجل أنت (تاريخ الطبري)

Thereafter, when Hadhrat Husein﵁ reaches Karbala and finds himself led into a trap, then too, one finds no mention of Mukhtaar and the thousands of followers, who had just recently welcomed Muslim ibn Aqeel﵁ into Kufa. Where did they all disappear to? Then, amazingly, just after the martyrdom of Hadhrat Husein﵁ and his loyal followers, suddenly Mukhtaar reappears, as a devout supporter of Hadhrat Husein﵁, desiring nothing but revenge for the Ahle-Bait.

Again, had Mukhtaar now kept a pious outlook till the end, one, with a very heavy heart, would perhaps be ready to again forgive Mukhtaar, and accept his tears of repentance, but this was not the case. Mukhtaar now sheds all his outer coverings, and allows his true chameleon colours to shine. First he rebels against Hadhrat Abdullâh ibn Zubeir﵁, to whom he had made all sorts of promises of loyalty. Then, after having the governor of Hadhrat Abdullâh ibn Zubeir﵁ removed from his post, he voices the claim that Muhammad ibn Hanafiyah, the son of Hadhrat Ali﵁, is the promised Mahdi, and that he, Mukhtaar, has been appointed to accept allegiance on his behalf. This ridiculous claim gets followed with even more ridiculous calls, and he eventually ends up announcing himself to be The Almighty Himself. Nauuzubillah!

The majority of the evil forces operating behind the scenes of Karbala have till today escaped investigation, but none shall ever manage to escape the interrogation which shall occur tomorrow, on the Day of Qiyamah. Despite these great efforts by Satanist hypocrites to keep their members disguised and out of the limelight, Almighty Allâh has always assured that some mention of these hidden elements spring to light, even if only for a brief while.

During the era of the Hadhrat Uthmaan and Hadhrat Aliؓ, the name of Abdullâh ibn Saba' would time and again spring to light, and by the grace of Almighty Allâh, there are many today who have at least understood this much, that this hypocrite was one of the evil elements behind many of the early conflicts that arose amongst the Muslims. Obviously, Abdullâh ibn Saba' was not the only one operating during his era, but at least one from the many evil forces of that era had been recognised.

However, when it came to Mukhtaar ibn Ubeid Thaqafi, for some unknown reason, this villain, despite his numerous appearances at strategic points, somehow managed to avoid the attention that he deserved, especially when it came to his role in the assassination of Hadhrat Huseinؓ.

In the following lines, a summary of some of Mukhtâr's activities shall be outlined, whereby one may, to a greater extent, realise the role played by this hypocrite in instigating Yazîd against the caravan of Hadhrat Huseinؓ, and thereafter in instigating the masses in Iraq against the ruling Ummayyad government.

- As mentioned above, during the era of Hadhrat Aliؓ and Hadhrat Hasanؓ, Mukhtaar openly displayed the hatred he bore against the men of Islâm, and in particular, the Ahle-Bait.

- Upon the death of Hadhrat Hasanؓ, Mukhtaar, in chameleon style, switches sides, and is now found in the forefront of those inviting Hadhrat Huseinؓ to Iraq, to lead the fight of the people of Iraq against the ruling government.

- When Muslim ibn Aqeelؓ arrived in Kufa, to ascertain whether the people of Iraq were truthful in their claim of being ready to

lend full support to Hadhrat Huseinؓ, it was this very Mukhtaar, according to one narration, who acted as his host[82]. Thereafter, due to certain unclear reasons, Muslim ibn Aqeelؓ left the residence of Mukhtaar and took shelter elsewhere.

- When Ubeidullah ibn Ziyaad arrived in Kufa, replacing Hadhrat Nu'maan ibn Bashirؓ as the newly appointed governor, Muslim ibn Aqeelؓ suddenly found himself in a predicament. The books of history describe the scenes that occurred thereafter, something to this effect, that in an effort to rally quick support, Muslimؓ scream out the slogan which had been agreed upon between him and the thousands of followers who had already pledged their allegiance for Hadhrat Huseinؓ. Hearing his scream, about four thousand supporters gathered and staged some sort of attack upon the royal palace, which forced Ubeidullah ibn Ziyaad to scramble for cover.

  The books of history clearly mention that Mukhtaar ibn Ubeid was amongst those who gathered at that moment. Thereafter, through some incomprehensible technique, Ubeidullah ibn Ziyaad managed to turn the tables completely. The books of history mention that Ubeidullah sent out well-respected men to encourage their tribe men to return home and abandon Muslim ibn Aqeelؓ. Had the four thousand men around Muslimؓ been genuine supporters, or even one tenth of them, this ploy would never have succeeded, yet as the books of history show, every single one of the followers around Muslimؓ disappeared, including Mukhtaar, leaving Muslimؓ all alone, at the mercy of

---

[82] حتى إذا كان زمن الحسين وبعث الحسين مسلم بن عقيل إلى الكوفة نزل دار المختار وهى اليوم دار سلم بن المسيب فبايعه المختار بن أبى عبيد فيمن بايعه من أهل الكوفة وناصحه ودعا إليه من أطاعه (الطبري)

Ubeidullah. (The numbers in these narrations and the manner in how these Iraqis abandoned Muslim seem exaggerated, but whatever the case may be, the question shall always remain as to why was Mukhtaar not at the side of Muslim ibn Aqeel, at a time when he was most in need of support!

Finding himself completely abandoned, Muslim ibn Aqeel went searching for some household which could offer him some sort of protection or at least act as a hideout, and after much begging and pleading, was finally allowed refuge in the house of a woman, whose son had not as yet arrived at home.

During these tense moments, where were the 18 000 people who had just a few days ago pledged allegiance to sacrifice their lives for the Ahle-Bait? Was is that they were too scared to show face, or rather was the entire episode an act of hypocrisy, just so that Hadhrat Husein could be lured to Kufa, so that his blessed blood could serve as a tool to reignite the flames of internal war, which the Ummah had just recently come out from?

Shortly thereafter, Muslim ibn Aqeel was arrested, and later executed. Just before his execution, he made a plea to Muhammad ibn Ash'ath, the officer who had been sent to arrest him. Before proceeding with the details of the plea that Muslim ibn Aqeel made, it would indeed seem appropriate to mention some history regarding this officer, Muhammad ibn Ash'ath, so that the issue of Karbala can become even clearer.

Muhammad ibn Ash'ath

Muhammad ibn Ash'ath was the son of Ash'ath ibn Qais. His father, Ash'ath accepted Islâm upon the hand of Rasulullâh, in the tenth year of Hijrah. During the period of Irtidaad, which occurred in the initial era of Hadhrat Abu Bakr, Ash'ath was amongst those misinformed and unfortunate souls that renegaded. Almighty Allâh however favoured him, and after being caught and brought in front of Hadhrat Abu Bakr, he repented sincerely and promised to recompense by continuously fighting in the path of Allâh. Hadhrat Abu Bakr understood that his repentance was indeed sincere, and even got him married to his own sister. From this union was born Muhammad ibn Ash'ath, who we are presently discussing.

Ash'ath ibn Qais, in accordance to his promise, thereafter devoted his life to Jihaad, and partook in many of the great and historic battles, viz. Yarmook, Qaadisiyah, Nahaawind, etc. During the battle of Siffin, he fought on the side of Hadhrat Ali. His loyalty towards Islâm and Hadhrat Ali was well known, and in honour of this loyalty, Hadhrat Hasan ibn Ali married his daughter, and kept her as his wife till the end. Ash'ath ibn Qais passed away shortly after the death of Hadhrat Ali, and Hadhrat Hasan himself performed his janaazah. (Usdul Gaabah)

Muhammad ibn Ash'ath was thus the nephew of Hadhrat Abu Bakr as well as the brother-in-law of Hadhrat Hasan. After being blessed with such close ties to Hadhrat Abu Bakr and to the Ahle-Bait, what would be the reason that this very Muhammad ibn Ash'ath now allies himself with the 'enemy' of the Ahle-Bait, and himself proceeds to arrest Hadhrat Muslim ibn Aqeel?

Shia hypocrites would love one to believe that this individual, as well as all the other prominent Sahâbah ﷺ and Tâbi'een of Kufa, had no real love for Islâm, but were only after fame and wealth. Nauuzubillah!

Not only does a stain of hypocrisy fall upon this individual if one were to believe the normally-mentioned chain of events regarding Karbala, but rather, this stain would fall on practically every individual of Kufa, since none of the people of Kufa stood with Hadhrat Muslim ibn Aqeel ﷺ, whereas at that time Kufa was the centre of Islâmic learning, thus many prominent figures were surely present at that time.

To understand this better, some names shall be provided of individuals who were present at that time, yet they never affiliated themselves with the call of Muslim ibn Aqeel ﷺ. After reading these names, one shall be forced to ask himself the question, that why did no individual of Kufa stand up in defence of Muslim ibn Aqeel ﷺ, and neither in the defence of Hadhrat Husein ﷺ, who as all were well aware, was on his way to Kufa.

The answer that one would finally be forced to accept, would be the very reason why the majority of the Sahâbah ﷺ and Tâbi'een did not accompany Hadhrat Husein ﷺ, when he set out towards Iraq, i.e. these individuals found no reason to stand up against the ruling government, especially after learning from Rasulullâh ﷺ that allegiance to a caliph should never be broken, unless and except where the caliph is found guilty of open kufr, which was not the case with Yazîd, even though Shia hypocrites would desire that we believe so.

Prominent figures present in Kufa, at the time of Karbala

Prominent figures, present in Kufa at the time when Hadhrat Husein‎ؓ was called over and martyred, would include, amongst many others, individuals such as:

a) Hadhrat Nu'maan ibn Basheerؓ

When Muslim ibn Aqeelؓ arrived, this illustrious Sahâbiؓ, was the governor of Kufa, on behalf of Yazîd. His love for the Ahle-Bait would not allow him to arrest Hadhrat Muslim ibn Aqeelؓ, but at the same time he made it clear that he would not delay in raising his sword, if heؓ found anyone rising against the caliph. The action and words of this illustrious Sahâbiؓ, when informed of the work of Muslim ibn Aqeelؓ and the coming of Hadhrat Huseinؓ, has been narrated in Al-Bidâyah. Ponder deeply over his conduct and words, and one shall soon realise that how Karbala has been explained today is far from the realities which those present in Kufa were witnessing. The text of Al Bidâyah is as follows:

'When the news of Hadhrat Muslim ibn Aqeelؓ and Hadhrat Huseinؓ reached Hadhrat Nu'maan ibn Bashirؓ, he behaved as though it had nothing to do with him. However he did deliver a sermon, in which he forbade the people from causing strife and dissension, and ordered them to remain united and upon the teachings of the Sunnah. During his sermon he announced,

'I shall not fight against one that does not fight against me, neither shall I attack the one who does not attack first! Also, merely on the basis of suspicion, I shall not arrest anyone.
However, by the oath of that Being in whose Hand lies my life, if you stand up against your Imaam and break your allegiance, I shall immediately raise the sword against you!

Thereafter, when Ubeidullah ibn Ziyaad reached Kufa, Hadhrat Nu'maan ibn Bashirﷺ mistook Ubeidullah to be Hadhrat Huseinﷺ. In the love of the Ahle-Bait he felt it too hard to issue any order against Hadhrat Huseinﷺ and thus locked himself up in the palace. When the sound of footsteps reached close, Hadhrat Nu'maan ibn Bashirﷺ, thinking it to be the footsteps of Hadhrat Huseinﷺ, in an apologetic manner, announced,

أنشدك الله ألا تنحيت عني! فوالله ما أنا بمسلم إليك أمانتي وما لي في قتالك من حاجة (الكامل)

<u>I plead with you that you leave this area, since I am unable to hand over to you this trust, and I at the same time do not wish to fight against you.[83]</u>

Why was he not prepared to hand over his post to Hadhrat Huseinﷺ? Was it his love for fame and power, or was it that he did not like the Ahle-Bait? Nay, rather due to not having found any reason in Kufa for an uprising, he could not understand why Hadhrat Huseinﷺ would even thing of inciting the population against the ruling government. In accordance to what he had seen and was seeing on the ground in Kufa, the Ummayyad government had been happily accepted as the ruling party, and thus breaking the allegiance, without a valid reason, was not acceptable.

Hisﷺ holding onto power had absolutely nothing to do with love for fame, thus we find that as soon as he realised it was Ubeidullah ibn Ziyaad at the door, who had been sent to replace him, he handed over his power immediately. Knowing well the personality of Ubeidullah ibn Ziyaad, and that he would hardly show mercy to the Ahle-Bait, Hadhrat

[83] ولما انتهى ابن زياد إلى باب القصر وهو متلثم ظنه النعمان بن بشير الحسين قد قدم فأغلق باب القصر وقال ما أنا بمسلم إليك أمانتي (البداية)

Nu'maan ibn Bashir‎ﷺ did express regret over Yazîd's choice, but, in accordance to the demands of Islâmic teachings, obedience to the caliph was incumbent.

b) Qadhi Shureih

Regarded as one of the most famous and prominent judges in Islâmic history, so much so, that Hadhrat Ali‎ﷺ himself declared him to be the best judge of the Arabs[84] during his era. Hadhrat Umar‎ﷺ had appointed this personality as judge over Kufa, and he held this post for years thereafter. The great scholars of Kufa, like Sha'bi, Ibrahim An-Nakha'ie, Muhammad ibn Sireen, etc, narrated Ahâdith from him.

When Ubeidullah ibn Ziyaad reached Kufa, Muslim ibn Aqeel‎ﷺ sought refuge in the house of a nobleman of the area, Haani ibn Urwah, since due to his close relationship with the Ummayyads the fear of his house being searched was minimal. However, through spies, the whereabouts of Muslim‎ﷺ soon became known and Haani was summoned in front of Ubeidullah ibn Ziyaad.

The news spread that Haani had been executed which, at that present moment, was not true. Upon hearing this, the tribe of Haani rushed towards the palace and were on the brink of storming it. Fearing their attack, Ubeidullah ibn Ziyaad ordered Qadhi Shureih to inform them that Haani was still alive and that he was merely being kept for questioning. The words of Qadhi Shureih to the mob that had gathered outside the palace, as narrated in Al-Bidâyah, shall hereunder be mentioned, which is worth pondering over. Addressing the crowds, Qadhi Shureih announced:

---

[84] فقال له علي: اذهب، فأنت أقضى العرب (تاريخ الاسلام للذهبي)

إن صاحبكم حي وقد ضربه سلطاننا ضربا لم يبلغ نفسه ، فانصرفوا ولا تحلوا بأنفسكم ولا بصاحبكم. (البداية)

'Your companion is alive! The Sultân has indeed punished him, but nothing fatal.
Thus disperse, and do not interfere in this matter!

Understanding the authority of Qadhi Shureih, the crowds dispersed. The question that arises is why did Qadhi Shureih at that tense moment, say what he said. Had he wished, he could easily have indicated to the crowds to attack, and that would have been the end of Ubeidullah ibn Ziyaad. Was this honourable judge of Islâm a sell-out, or a coward, or one who hated the Ahle-Bait?! If the story of Karbala was truly in accordance to what is normally known, the basic demand of the love of the Ahle-Bait would have never allowed Qadhi Shureih to do what he had done. So what then spurred him on to make peace between the angry crowds and Ubeidullah ibn Ziyaad?

The only reason behind him doing what he did was that he too saw no reason for fractions in Kufa to stand up against the state. Ubeidullah ibn Ziyaad, in Qadhi Shureih's understanding, had been sent to repress a possible uprising, and thus had every right to take into custody anyone accused of lending aid to the opposition.

Yes, the conduct of Ubeidullah ibn Ziyaad thereafter with Muslim ibn Aqeelرضي الله عنه and Haani ibn Urwah, wherein he had them executed without mercy, that was indeed an act of oppression, but Qadhi Shureih cannot be held accountable for that, since he had no knowledge of what was to happen.

c) Muhammad ibn Ash'ath

The third individual, who played a major role in the incident of Karbala, was Muhammad ibn Ash'ath, the son of Ash'ath ibn Qais, whose biography, as well as the close relationship between his father and Hadhrat Ali, has been discussed.

When Ubeidullah ibn Ziyaad took over, Muhammad ibn Ash'ath, being a chief member of the police force, was ordered to arrest Hadhrat Muslim ibn Aqeel. As with the two personalities mentioned above, here too, Muhammad ibn Ash'ath participating in the arrest of Hadhrat Muslim ibn Aqeel, and standing on the side of Ubeidullah ibn Ziyaad, this had nothing to do with hatred for the Ahle Bait and love for the Ummayyads. In fact, when one studies the words and actions of all these individuals, one would quickly come to realize that their hearts were brimming with the love of the Ahle Bait. Their obedience to the Ummayyad government was only and solely due to the demand of Islâmic teachings that once one pledges allegiance to a ruler, he should never break his allegiance, nor disobey his ruler's command, as long as it is not clearly against the Shariah.

Thus one finds that when Muslim ibn Aqeel was arrested, and after realising that the inviters to Iraq were all hypocrites and that Hadhrat Husein was being led into a trap; at that juncture Muslim ibn Aqeel did not trust any of the people who had just recently pledged their allegiance at his hands, to deliver his second message to Hadhrat Husein, a message vital to save the life of Hadhrat Husein. At this critical juncture, Hadhrat Muslim ibn Aqeel **asks Muhammad ibn Ash'ath** to ensure that his letter reaches Hadhrat Husein. Had he the slightest doubt regarding Muhammad ibn Ash'ath's love for the Ahle-Bait, he would never have entrusted him with delivering the letter, especially at such a crucial moment.

The crux of this message, as recorded from Tabari in Al-Bidâyah, is as follows[85]:

'When Muslim ibn Aqeel was arrested, he was found crying. Ubeidullah ibn Abbaas Sulemi, finding this astonishing, remarked, 'It is not befitting a man of your caliber, who has set out on a mission such as yours to cry in the face of difficulty!' Hadhrat Muslim ibn Aqeel ﵁ replied, 'I am not crying in the fear that I am about to be killed, but rather over the misfortune that is soon to befall Hadhrat Husein ﵁ and his family!'

Muslim ibn Aqeel ﵁ thereafter turned to Muhammad ibn Ash'ath, saying,
'O Abdullâh, by Allâh, I do not believe that Ubeidullah ibn Ziyaad shall give any regard to the guarantee of safety that you have given me. I however would deeply appreciate if you could send someone to Hadhrat Husein ﵁, with a message from my side, the words of which are:

O Husein, I am now a prisoner, and shall most probably soon be killed. Please return at once with your family, and ***do not fall for the trap of***

[85] وفي رواية ذكرها ابن جرير أن مسلم بن عقيل لما بكى قال له عبيد الله بن عباس السلمي إن من يطلب مثل ما تطلب لا يبكى إذ انزل به مثل الذى نزل بك قال إنى والله ما لنفسى أبكى ومالها من القتل أرثى وإن كنت لم أحب لها طرفة عين تلفا ولكننى أبكى لأهلى المقبلين إلى الكوفة أبكى الحسين وآل حسين ثم أقبل على محمد بن الأشعث فقال يا عبد الله إنى والله أراك ستعجز عن أمانى فهل عندك خير تستطيع أن تبعث رجلا على لسانى يبلغ حسينا عنى رسالة فانى لا أراه إلا قد خرج إليكم اليوم أو غدا هو واهل بيته وإن ما تراه من جزعى لذلك فتقول له إن ابن عقيل بعثنى إليك وهو فى أيدى القوم أسير لا يدرى أيصبح أم يمسى حتى يقتل وهو يقول لك ارجع بأهلك ولا يغرنك أهل الكوفة فانهم أصحاب أبيك الذى كان يتمنى فراقهم بالموت أو القتل أن أهل الكوفة قد كذبوك وكذبونى وليس لكاذب رأى فقال ابن الاشعث والله لأفعلن ولأعلمن ابن زياد أنى قد أمنتك قال أبو مخنف فدعا محمد بن الأشعث إياس بن العباس الطائى من بنى مالك بن ثمامة وكان شاعرا فقال له اذهب فالق حسينا فأبلغه هذا الكتاب وكتب فيه الذى أمره به ابن عقيل ثم أعطاه راحلة وتكفل له بالقيام بأهله وداره فخرج حتى لقى الحسين بزبالة لأربع ليال من الكوفة فأخبره الخبر وأبلغه الرسالة (البداية)

the people of Kufa, the very men from whom your father desired separation, even if it had to come through death. The people of Kufa have lied to you, and to me, *and the requests and opinions of liars hold no weight.*

Muhammad ibn Ash'ath promised to have the message conveyed, and fulfilled his promise by sending out a messenger and taking full responsibility of the needs of the family of the messenger until his return. Muhammad ibn Ash'ath also informed Ibn Ziyaad that he had promised Muslim ibn Aqeel ﵁ that he would not be harmed, but as Muslim ibn Aqeel ﵁ had already predicted, Ibn Ziyaad showed no respect to his promise, and had Muslim ibn Aqeel ﵁ executed. The messenger, sent by Muhammad ibn Ash'ath reached Hadhrat Husein ﵁ about four days prior to his reaching Kufa, but after having come so far, Hadhrat Husein ﵁ felt it appropriate to now continue ahead.

From this incident, two important matters come to light, viz.

- Despite working for the Ummayyad government, the Ahle-Sunnah of Iraq respected and loved the Ahle-Bait, and till the very end did what was within their capacity to save Hadhrat Husein ﵁ from falling into a trap.

- In the warning that Muslim ibn Aqeel issued, he was not warning Hadhrat Husein ﵁ from the dangers of the Ummayyads, but rather from falling into a trap that had been set up in Kufa, by the very people that had called him over.

d) Umar ibn Sa'd, the son of Hadhrat Sa'd ibn Abi Waqqâs ﵁

The forth individual, acting on behalf of the Ummayyads, but brimming with the love of the Ahle-Bait, was Umar ibn Sa'd. Books dealing with

the issue of Karbala generally depict this personality as an evil, blood-thirsty oppressor, solely due to him being the commander of the army sent out to halt Hadhrat Husein and prevent him from entering Kufa. Here too, a mere introduction and a few statements made by this individual, during the sad episode of Karbala shall be more than sufficient to show that his obedience to the commands of the state had nothing to do with hatred for the Ahle-Bait, but was based solely and only upon the law of *'obedience to the caliph is essential, as long as open, clear-cut kufr (disbelief) is not manifest'*.

Thus we find that when Muslim ibn Aqeel realized he was going to be killed, he sought permission to have a word in privacy with Umar ibn Sa'd, and as he had done with Muhammad ibn Ash'ath, here too, instead of seeking help from one of those who had initially hosted him, or from one of those that had initially pledged allegiance at his hands, he sought the help of Umar ibn Sa'd, and at his hands made his final wasiyah(bequest), the first sentence of which, as narrated in Akhbaar-al-Tiwaal of Hafiz Ad-Dinawari[86], was:

'I need to make a bequest in private, and at the present moment I find none that holds a closer relationship to me than you.'(Hadhrat Sa'd ibn Abi Waqqâs was family of Rasulullâh thus Umar ibn Sa'd and Muslim ibn Aqeel, enjoyed close family ties.)

[86] اخل معي في طرف هذا البيت حتى أوصي إليك، فليس في القوم أقرب إلي ولا أولى بي منك. فتنحى معه ناحية، فقال له: (أتقبل وصيتي ؟ قال: نعم. قال مسلم: إن على هاهنا دينا، مقدار ألف درهم، فاقض عني، وإذا أنا قتلت فاستوهب من ابن زياد جثتي لئلا يمثل بها، وابعث إلى الحسين بن علي رسولا قاصدا من قبلك، يعلمه حالي، وما صرت إليه من غدر هؤلاء الذين يزعمون انهم شيعته، وأخبره بما كان من نكثهم بعد أن بايعني منهم ثمانية عشر ألف رجل، لينصرف إلى حرم الله، فيقيم به، ولا يغتر بأهل الكوفة. وقد كان مسلم كتب إلى الحسين أن يقدم ولا يلبث. فقال له عمر بن سعد: لك على ذلك كله، وأنا به زعيم. فانصرف إلى ابن زياد، فأخبره بكل ما أوصى به إليه مسلم. فقال له ابن زياد: قد أسأت في أفشائك ما أسره إليك، وقد قيل (إنه لا يخونك إلا الأمين، وربما ائتمنك الخائن) (الاخبار الطوال للدينوري)

Muslim ibn Aqeel ﵁ first asked Umar ibn Sa'd to pay back on his behalf the loans he had taken in Kufa, which equalled to about one thousand dirhams. (Will one ever ask his enemy to pay on his behalf his debts?) The second request was that Umar ibn Sa'd request from Ibn Ziyaad that he does not mutilate his body. The third request, which was the most important, was that Umar ibn Sa'd send a message to Hadhrat Husein ﵁ warning him of the impeding danger. The wording of the message that Muslim ibn Aqeel ﵁ asked to be conveyed to Hadhrat Husein ﵁, indeed demands a few moments of contemplation, thus read it slowly and carefully, especially the part under-lined.

وابعث إلى الحسين بن علي رسولا قاصدا من قبلك، يعلمه حالي، وما صرت إليه من غدر هؤلاء الذين يزعمون انهم شيعته،

وأخبره بما كان من نكثهم بعد أن بايعني منهم ثمانية عشر ألف رجل، لينصرف إلى حرم الله، فيقيم به، ولا يغتر بأهل الكوفة

'Send a message to Husein ibn Ali ﵁, informing him of my condition, and ***the plight I have ended up in, due to the deception of those who claim to be your helpers****. Inform him of how 18 000, who had pledged allegiance at my hands, have suddenly broken their allegiance! Beg him to please return to the Haram (Makkah Mukarramah or Madinah Munawwara) and to remain there,* ***and to never allow himself to again be deceived by the people of Kufa****!*

Umar ibn Sa'd immediately set out to fulfil his bequest. The issue of paying of the debts was an easy matter. As for the other two requests, it needed the permission of Ubeidullah ibn Ziyaad, thus Umar ibn Sa'd mentioned it before him. Ubeidullah ibn Ziyaad however, instead of respecting the bequest, and the promise of Umar ibn Sa'd, mocked him for revealing the contents of the discussion, and against his wish, had the head of Muslim ibn Aqeel ﵁ severed, and sent to Yazîd.

Together with the head of Muslim ibn Aqeel, Ubeidullah ibn Ziyaad sent two men to explain what had happened, and obviously, being the confidants of Ubeidullah ibn Ziyaad, the picture that they would portray to Yazîd would only be their side of the story, regarding the effort of Muslim ibn Aqeel﵁ to overthrow the government, and how Ubeidullah ibn Ziyaad managed, just in time, to nip it in the bud.

After hearing their story, Yazîd, due to being so far away and trusting fully the words of his confidants, expressed pleasure at the achievements of Ubeidullah ibn Ziyaad, and sent back with them a second command, regarding the coming of Hadhrat Husein﵁, the details of which shall follow soon.

Summary of the chapter above

The crux of what has been mentioned above thus far is that before the death of Muslim ibn Aqeel﵁, he﵁ clearly realized that the true lovers of Hadhrat Husein﵁ were not those who had invited him over, or those who had come in large numbers to pledge their allegiance, but rather it was the very ones who were not desirous of seeing any new war starting amongst the Muslims, which would include people like Hadhrat Nu'maan ibn Bashir﵁, Haani ibn Urwah, Muhammad ibn Ash'ath, Umar ibn Sa'd, Qadhi Shureih, etc. Thus, when Muslim ibn Aqeel﵁ cursed and lamented, his complain was not against the people of Kufa, who were not prepared to break their allegiance to Yazîd, but rather his curse and complain was against the liars and hypocrites of Kufa, who had absolutely no love for any of the Ahle-Bait, and were desirous of nothing but re-igniting the flames of war amongst the Muslims, using the blood of the Ahle-Bait as bait for their satanic ambitions.

It is solely for this reason, that when one ponders over the names of those who had invited Hadhrat Husein﵁ over, or over the names of the thousands who had pledged allegiance to Muslim ibn Aqeel﵁, and

then suddenly abandoned him when he needed them most, one shall find no mention of any of the great Sahâbah﵁ and Tâbi'een of that time.

The fact that hardly any mention can be found of any of the illustrious students of Hadhrat Abdullâh ibn Masood﵁ and Hadhrat Ali﵁ joining the movement of Muslim ibn Aqeel﵁, that itself speaks volumes of the nature of this incident, and the liars who were behind it!

Hadhrat Husein﵁, trusting upon the dozens of letters that he had received from hypocrite quarters, had due reason to march to Iraq, but the population of Iraq, having not seen any of the matters which these letters had described, were obviously not going to join any rebellion, without due reason. As for the love of the Ahle-Bait, that was embedded deep in the hearts of practically every individual of Kufa, and similar is the case with every member of the Ahle-Sunnah Wal Jama'ah, this love however in no way necessitated that they join the rebellion against the government. Then too, the love for the Ahle-Bait forced many individuals of Kufa into a quarry, that on the one side obedience to the caliph was essential, while on the other, they just could not bear to see harm coming to the Ahle Bait.

When one studies deeply the incident of Karbala, he shall find that the people that had made the greatest attempts to save the Ahle Bait were not the ones that had invited and begged Hadhrat Husein﵁ to come over, but rather those that had nothing to do with the rebellion.

The journey to Karbala

After receiving the news of the execution of Muslim ibn Aqeel﵁ and hearing the story of his rebellion, as depicted by the two men sent by Ubeidullah ibn Ziyaad, Yazîd ibn Muawiyah sent a command back that Ubeidullah should now halt Hadhrat Husein﵁, and prevent him﵁ from

causing any uprising. The command issued by Yazîd ibn Muawiyah however clearly showed, as his illustrious father had bequeathed, that he had absolutely no desire to see Hadhrat Husein رضي الله عنه killed.
Yazîd was never thirsty for the blood of Hadhrat Husein رضي الله عنه, neither before and not now. All he wanted was to ensure that an uprising does not occur, which would then result in years of in-fighting again. Had Yazîd desired to have Hadhrat Husein رضي الله عنه martyred, he could easily have issued such a command to his governors of Makkah Mukarramah and Madinah Munawwara, that they murder Hadhrat Husein رضي الله عنه, either in the Holy Lands itself, or anywhere in the desert, after his departure from the city.

Rather, history itself shows that Yazîd had great concern that Hadhrat Husein رضي الله عنه not be led into a trap by the people of Iraq, which could easily result in his death. For this reason, we find that Yazîd himself wrote to Hadhrat Abdullâh ibn Abbaas رضي الله عنه, that he should somehow or the other discourage Hadhrat Husein رضي الله عنه from leaving Hijaaz for Iraq. Hafiz Ibn Kathir, in Al-Bidâyah, quotes:

'Yazîd ibn Muawiyah wrote to Hadhrat Abdullâh ibn Abbaas رضي الله عنه, and after informing him that Hadhrat Husein رضي الله عنه had already left for Makkah Mukarramah, expressed his concern in the following manner:

'It is my understanding that some men from the East (Iraq) have tricked him into believing that they shall make him caliph, whereas you are well aware of their lies and tricks. If he رضي الله عنه has fallen for their offer, then indeed, he has cut a firm family tie. You are amongst the heads of this family, and one whose opinion is heard, thus stop him رضي الله عنه from doing such an act that shall result in division.

Yazîd, together with the above appeal, also included some verses of poetry[87], addressing Hadhrat Abdullâh ibn Abbaas ﷺ and the Qureish of Makkah Mukarramah and Madinah Munawwara, a rough translation of which is:

'O rider, travelling upon a unique animal, as it flies across the deserts, on my behalf inform the Qureish, who are very far away from me, that I have placed Allâh ﷻ and the demand of family ties between me and Husein ﷺ. And I will surely come to Makkah itself to discuss this matter with him ﷺ.

I beg him ﷺ in the name of Allâh, through whose Name responsibilities get fulfilled, (that he ﷺ does not proceed ahead to Iraq) (If he ﷺ does leave for Iraq) your tribe shall then have to bear great grief, such a tribe that has been blessed with the most noble and pure of mothers, i.e. Hadhrat Fatimah ﷺ, who is the daughter of Rasulullâh ﷺ, and the best that man has ever known. Her ﷺ virtue is virtue for you, and through her all others also enjoy some virtue.

It is my strong feeling that the one in whom you take pride, (i.e. Hadhrat Husein ﷺ) very soon he shall be leaving you, and shall perhaps end up killed, with vultures eating from his blessed body.

O my nation, do not reignite the flames of war after it has died down, rather hold firm onto the rope of unity. Our forefathers and those of previous nations had indeed seen plenty of war amongst themselves, thus I beg that your noble nation view this matter without any prejudice, and that you choose not to throw your bold warrior

---

87 يا أيها الراكب العادي مطيته * على عذافرة في سيرها فحم , أبلغ قريشا على نأي المزار بها * بيني وبين حسين الله والرحم
وموقف بفناء البيت أنشده * عهد الاله وما توفي به الذمم عنيتم قومكم فخرا بأمكم * أم لعمري حصان برة كرم هي التي لا يداني
فضلها أحد * بنت الرسول وخير الناس قد علموا
وفضلها لكم فضل وغيركم من قومكم لهم في فضلها قسم
إني لاعلم أو ظنا كعالمه * والظن يصدق أحيانا فينتظم أن سوف يترككم ما تدعون بها * قتلى تهاداكم العقبان والرخم
يا قومنا لا تشبوا الحرب إذ مسكت * ومسكوا بحبال السلم , واعتصموا قد جرب الحرب من قد كان قبلكم * من القرون وقد
بادت بها الامم
فانصفوا قومكم لا تهلكوا برحا, * فرب ذي برح زلت به القدم (البداية) * و في ابن الاعثم بدل "برحا" بذخا في الموضعين

(Husein) to his destruction, for verily at times bold warriors do have terrible slips!

Hadhrat Abdullâh ibn Abbaas replied to this letter of Yazîd, and again a brief pondering over his answer shall be more than sufficient to show that Hadhrat Husein going over to Iraq had nothing to do with Yazîd being an adulterer, drunkard, etc. Hadhrat Abdullâh ibn Abbaas answered:

إني لارجو أن لا يكون خروج الحسين لامر تكرهه،

ولست أدع النصيحة له في كل ما تجتمع به الالفة وتطفي به الثائرة، (البداية)

'I have hope that Hadhrat Husein's leaving Madinah Munawwara is not due to any matter that would displease you (i.e. I do not feel he shall stand up against you.) Then too, I shall continue advising him regarding all matters which deals with keeping the Ummah united and extinguishing the flames of in-fighting.

Hadhrat Abdullâh ibn Abbaas thereafter proceeded to Hadhrat Husein, and contrary to what he had assumed, found Hadhrat Husein determined to leave immediately for Iraq. The details of what thereafter transpired and how various other Sahâbah and Tâbi'een attempted to dissuade Hadhrat Husein from leaving, that has already been mentioned in the chapter titled 'The issue between Hadhrat Husein and Yazîd'. We shall thus suffice with the mere mentioning of their names, so that again it can be made clear that no one, not even Hadhrat Husein had any issue with the character of Yazîd.

Illustrious personalities, who tried to dissuade Hadhrat Husein from proceeding ahead to Iraq, include amongst others:

Mohammad ibn Al-Hanafiyah
Hadhrat Abdullâh ibn Umar
Hadhrat Abdullâh ibn Abbaas
Hadhrat Abu Saeed Al-Khudri

Hadhrat Jaabir ibn Abdullâhﷺ
Hadhrat Miswar ibn Makhramahﷺ
Hadhrat Amrah bint Abdur Rahmaan (the grand- daughter of Hadhrat Sa'd ibn Zuraarahﷺ)
Abu Bakr ibn Abdur Rahmaan (one of the famous seven Fuqahah of Madinah Munawwara)
Hadhrat Abdullâh ibn Ja'farﷺ (the son of Hadhrat Ja'far At-Tayyaarﷺ)

Hadhrat Huseinﷺ however, after receiving assurance from Muslim ibn Aqeelﷺ that he had knowledge of eighteen thousand die-hards in Kufa, and behind these eighteen thousand there were obviously thousands more just waiting for hisﷺ arrival; after getting this assurance, accompanied by close family members, he left for Iraq. The intention of Hadhrat Huseinﷺ was to settle in Iraq and join those who desired to become his warriors. For this reason, Hadhrat Huseinﷺ left with women and children.

The second letter of Muslim ibn Aqeelﷺ, in which the treachery of the Iraqis was exposed, reached Hadhrat Huseinﷺ after much of the journey had already been completed. Its contents greatly saddened Hadhrat Huseinﷺ, firstly because it got delivered together with the news of the death of Muslim ibn Aqeelﷺ, and secondly because his trust and hopes in the people of Iraq had been crushed. At that juncture, Hadhrat Huseinﷺ actually did consider acting upon the advice of the second letter, and returning back to Medina Munawwara, but two reasons finally made him move forward, viz.

a) Some of the group suggested that perhaps when the people of Iraq would see Hadhrat Huseinﷺ personally, they would abandon their cowardice and live up to their promises of supporting himﷺ to the very end.

b) Those very close to Muslim ibn Aqeelﷺ were intent on going forward and investigating the reasons behind the execution of

Muslim ibn Aqeel﵁, since there was no real reason to have Muslim ibn Aqeel﵁ executed. Hadhrat Husein﵁ felt that since they had come all the way with him, he﵁ might as well continue ahead and at least question the reasons behind the execution of Muslim ibn Aqeel﵁.

Arriving at Karbala

Yazîd had already written to Ubeidullah ibn Ziyaad that he should keep a strict eye on the movements of Hadhrat Husein﵁ and ensure that an uprising does not occur in Iraq. At the same time Yazîd had also issued the instruction that the caravan of Hadhrat Husein﵁ not be attacked, unless they attack first, which was most unlikely. Strict orders were given that no major decision be taken except after receiving guidance from the government in Shâm[88].

In fact, if one were to scrutinize the pages of history, one shall find that just before the arrival of Muslim ibn Aqeel﵁, Yazîd was on the verge of having Ubeidullah ibn Ziyaad removed from his post as governor over Basrah, due to misgivings he had about him. When Muslim ibn Aqeel﵁ reached Kufa, the governor, on behalf of the Ummayyads, was Hadhrat Nu'maan ibn Bashir﵁. Had Hadhrat Nu'maan﵁ remained as governor, the incident of Karbala, as it occurred, would perhaps never have transpired, and the flames of war amongst the Ummah would not have been re-ignited. Hadhrat Nu'maan ibn Bashir﵁ would have merely arrested `Muslim ibn Aqeel﵁, if he found the matter getting out of hand, and have him and Hadhrat Husein﵁ sent over to Shâm, so that the matter could be sorted out there properly.

Shaitaani forces were well aware of this, thus plans were made to have Hadhrat Nu'maan ibn Bashir﵁ removed and Ubeidullah ibn Ziyaad brought in his place. This required just two moves, made at the right

[88] وإنه قد بلغني أن الحسين بن على قد توجه نحو العراق فضع المناظر والمسالح واحترس على الظن وخذ على التهمة غير ألا تقتل إلا من قاتلك واكتب إلى في كل ما يحدث من الخبر والسلام عليك و رحمة الله (تاريخ الطبري)

time, and backed with the propaganda and drama that shaitaani forces are masters at.

The first of these two moves was to have Yazîd's faith in Hadhrat Nu'maan ibn Bashirؓ broken. For this, letters from Kufa were sent to Yazîd, warning of a rebellion that was on the verge of breaking out, and that Nu'maan ibn Bashirؓ was doing practically nothing to sort out the problem. The contents of the letters, and the names and signatures that accompanied them (which were most probably forged) would have confused the greatest of leaders, and thus Yazîd can never be blamed for falling for the trap. Describing the scene prevailing in the court of Yazîd, Tabari writes[89]:

(Abdullâh ibn Muslim, after engaging in a heated debate with Nu'maan ibn Bashirؓ regarding why he was acting so cowardly, wrote to Yazîd: 'Muslim ibn Aqeel has come to Kufa and many have already pledged their allegiance to Husein. If you have any desire that Kufa remains yours, you must send immediately someone strong, who shall deal with your enemy as you would have dealt with them. As for Nu'maan ibn Bashir, he is a weak leader, or perhaps he is just acting weak!

This was the first letter that reached Yazîd regarding the dangerous situation in Kufa. Thereafter the letter of ibn Uqbah arrived, followed almost immediately by the letter of Umar ibn Sa'd , both mentioning the very same thing.

---

[89] وخرج عبد الله بن مسلم وكتب إلى يزيد بن معاوية أما بعد فان مسلم بن عقيل قد قدم الكوفة فبايعته الشيعة للحسين بن على فان كان لك بالكوفة حاجة فابعث إليها رجلا قويا ينفذ أمرك ويعمل مثل عملك في عدوك فان النعمان بن بشير رجل ضعيف أو هو يتضعف فكان أول من كتب إليه ثم كتب إليه عمارة بن عقبة بنحو من كتابه ثم كتب إليه عمر بن سعد بن أبى وقاص بمثل ذلك قال هشام قال عوانة فلما اجتمعت الكتب عند يزيد ليس بين كتبهم إلا يومان دعا يزيد بن معاوية سرجون مولى معاوية فقال ما رأيك فان حسينا قد توجه نحو الكوفة ومسلم بن عقيل بالكوفة يبايع للحسين وقد بلغني عن النعمان ضعف وقول سيئ وأقرأه كتبهم فما ترى من أستعمل على الكوفة وكان يزيد عاتبا على عبيدالله بن زياد فقال سرجون أرأيت معاوية لو نشر لك أكنت آخذا برأيه قال نعم فأخرج عهد عبيد الله على الكوفة فقال هذا رأى معاوية ومات وقد أمر بهذا الكتاب فأخذ برأيه وضم المصرين إلى عبيدالله (تاريخ الطبري) فأشار إلى يزيد سرجون الرومي كاتب أبيه بعبيد الله بن زياد، وكان منحرفاً عنه (سبط النجوم)

Hishâm said, quoting from Awaanah, 'After reading these letters, which arrived, one after the other, in the space of just two days, Yazîd ibn Muawiyah acceded to the advice of Sarjoon, the freed slave of Hadhrat Muawiyah, that none but Ubeidullah ibn Ziyaad could sort out the situation, whereas at that moment Yazîd was not seeing eye-to-eye with Ibn Ziyaad) End of quote

Whether Umar ibn Sa'd really wrote such a letter, that is definitely questionable, especially considering the fact that from the arrival of Ubeidullah ibn Ziyaad till the very end, he continuously expressed displeasure with the commands being issued by Ibn Ziyaad. This letter was thus most probably forged in the name of Umar ibn Sa'd. Whatever the case may be, such letters were most definitely going to get Yazîd searching for a solution.

The second move of the shaitaani forces was to have Ubeidullah ibn Ziyaad brought in, in the place of Hadhrat Nu'maan ibn Bashirؓ. Yazîd himself did not choose Ibn Ziyaad, since at that time Yazîd was having misgivings with regards to him[90]. Yazîd was in fact instigated into allowing Ibn Ziyaad to take charge, a move that would soon ruin the image of Yazîd throughout the Muslim world.

Regarding this, Tabari narrates:
'In search of a solution to the problem facing him, Yazîd ibn Muawiyah sought the counsel of Sarjoon, the freed slave of Hadhrat Muawiyahؓ. At that present moment, Yazîd was not seeing eye-to-eye with Ubeidullah ibn Ziyaad (and Sarjoon was well aware of that). Sarjoon thus asked, 'If Muawiyahؓ himself had to be brought alive, and he were to give advice in this matter, would you be prepared to accept his advice?' Yazîd responded in the affirmative. Sarjoon thereafter drew out a document in which it was stated that Hadhrat Muawiyah had,

---

90 فأشار إلى يزيد سرجون الرومي كاتب أبيه بعبيد الله بن زياد، وكان منحرفاً عنه (سمط النجوم العوالي في أنباء الأوائل والتوالي للعصامي)

just before his death, written that Ubeidullah ibn Ziyaad be placed in charge of Kufa. Seeing this letter, Yazîd forgot his misgivings regarding Ibn Ziyaad, and ordered that together with Basrah, (over which he was governor) the rule of Kufa now also be handed over to him.'

Whether Hadhrat Muawiyahؓ had ever written such a thing that shall perhaps never be known with certainty. Whatever the case may be, the narrations above show clearly that the appointment of Ibn Ziyaad was not a brain-storm of Yazîd, but rather upon the inciting of the 'forged' letters from Kufa, followed with the pushing advice of Sarjoon ibn Mansoor.

Sarjoon, as the books of history explain, was one of the senior leaders of the christian army that came out to face the Muslims during the era of Hadhrat Abu Bakrؓ. After being taking as captive, he began serving in Shâm, as a slave, in many top government posts due to his expertise in the field of finance, especially since the financial matters at that time were still being recorded in Persian, in registers known as '*Diwaan*'. In the era of Hadhrat Muawiyahؓ, he rose to the position of being one of Hadhrat Muawiyahؓ's right-hand men[91], and perhaps due to his outward loyalty, or due to his accepting Islâm at the hands of Hadhrat Muawiyahؓ, he was finally set free.

Whether Sarjoon was sincere in his intentions or not when he proposed the name of Ubeidullah ibn Ziyaad, that is for Almighty Allâh alone to decide. However it is a point worth noting that Ubeidullah ibn Ziyaad's selection was not done by any Sahâbiؓ or illustrious Tabi'ee, but rather by a former christian/recently-reverted-Muslim freed-slave, Sarjoon ibn Mansoor.

Hadhrat Huseinؓ speaks

[91] سرجون بن منصور الرومي كاتب معاوية وابنه يزيد بن معاوية وعبد الملك بن مروان ذكره أبو الحسين الرازي في تسمية كتاب أمراء دمشق وذكر أنه كان نصرانيا فأسلم (تاريخ دمشق)

From the time that Hadhrat Husein found himself facing the army of Ubeidullah ibn Ziyaad, in practically every statement that he uttered, some or the other indication can be found of whatever has been discussed above, i.e.

a) His coming to Iraq was merely on the basis that, as he had been led to believe, there were many in Iraq who had not as yet pledged allegiance to Yazîd, and were rather desirous of pledging allegiance to him
b) Besides the issue of fighting for the caliphate, he had no other issue with Yazîd, i.e. he never held any misconception regarding Yazîd's deen, private life, etc.
c) The traitors and evil men in the entire episode were not Yazîd and his government, situated in Shâm, but rather the hypocrites who had sent countless of forged letters, inviting him over, and who had deceived Muslim ibn Aqeel into believing that Hadhrat Husein did indeed have a huge following in Iraq.
d) If he had known from the beginning that the people of Iraq were happy with the Ummayyad rule, he would never have come over, but would rather have remained in Hijaaz and allowed the Ummayyads the right to rule.

The above points can easily be picked up from the numerous statements made by Hadhrat Husein before his martyrdom. From these statements, two statements however deserve a little extra attention, viz.

1) 'A man, who had met Hadhrat Husein shortly before his death, narrated to Yazîd Ar-Rashk,

'I noticed some tents pitched in an open area. Upon enquiry, I was informed that these were the tents of Hadhrat Husein. I approached and found within one tent an elderly man reciting Quraan, whilst tears flowed down his cheeks and beard. I asked, "O

grandson of Rasulullâh ﷺ, what has brought you to this barren area? He ؓ replied,

'The letters of the people of Kufa,
*and **I have a strong feeling that these very people are now going to kill me**!*[92]

2) When Umar ibn Sa'd, the leader of the army sent by Ubeidullah ibn Ziyaad, came in front of Hadhrat Husein ؓ, he ؓ said,

'O Umar! Allow me one of three options:

a) Either let me return to where I have come from, i.e. Madinah Munawwara

b) If that is too difficult, **then allow me to proceed to Yazîd, at whose hands I shall pledge allegiance, and he can thereafter judge regarding me as he wills**

c) And if that is not acceptable, then place me in an army heading towards the Turks, against whom I shall continue fighting till my death

Umar ibn Sa'd was happy with these options, but as a mere formality, sent a message to Ubeidullah ibn Ziyaad enquiring regarding which option to choose. Shimr ibn Haushab, (a senior member of the cabinet of Ubeidullah) objected severely and demanded that Hadhrat Husein ؓ be brought in front of Ibn Ziyaad. Hadhrat Husein ؓ was not happy with the decision of Shimr and refused to present himself in front of Ibn Ziyaad. Umar ibn Sa'd was ordered to attack, but he showed unwillingness. Ubeidullah ibn Ziyaad thus had him removed from his post as leader and appointed Shimr in his place, and in fact even

[92] وقال محمد بن سعد: حدثنا موسى بن إسماعيل، ثنا جعفر بن سليمان، عن يزيد الرشك قال: حدثني من شافه الحسين قال: رأيت أخبية مضروبة بفلاة من الارض فقلت: لمن هذه ؟ قالوا: هذه لحسين قال: فأتيته فإذا شيخ يقرأ القرآن والدموع تسيل على خديه ولحيته، قال قلت: بأبي وأمي يا بن بنت رسول الله ما أنزلك هذه البلاد والفلاة التي ليس بها أحد ؟ فقال: هذه كتب أهل الكوفة إلي ولا أراهم إلا قاتلي، (البناية)

ordered him to execute Umar ibn Sa'd, (if he found him to be a barrier)[93]

While both of the above statements serve as eye-openers, it is the second one that really puts a nail in the entire episode of lies, which shaitaani forces desire all to believe regarding Karbala. Had Yazîd really been a drunkard, an adulterer, etc, and had that been the basis of Hadhrat Husein ﷻ standing up against him, why would he now, right at the end of his life, be prepared to himself proceed to Shâm and pledge allegiance at the hands of Yazîd? Could it ever be possible that this lion of Islâm, merely in the fear of death, would forget his mission of fighting against sinful rulers, and would actually agree to even join under their ranks? Nauuzubillah!

Had Yazîd been committing open acts of kufr and evil in the court of the caliphate, Hadhrat Husein ﷻ would never have been prepared to even present himself in front of Yazîd, forget pledging allegiance at his hands!

---

[93] **وبعث عبيد الله بن زياد عمر بن سعد لقتالهم، فقال له الحسين: يا عمر اختر مني إحدى ثلاث خصال، إما أن تتركني أرجع كما جئت، فإن أبيت هذه فسيرني إلى يزيد فأضع يدي في يده فيحكم في ما رأى، فإن أبيت هذه فسيرني إلى الترك فأقاتلهم حتى أموت. فأرسل إلى ابن زياد بذلك، فهم أن يسيره إلى يزيد، فقال شمر بن ذي الجوشن: لا ! إلا أن ينزل على حكمك، فأرسل إلى الحسين بذلك فقال الحسين: والله لا أفعل، وأبطأ عمر عن قتاله فأرسل ابن زياد شمر بن ذي الجوشن وقال له: إن تقدم عمر فقاتل وإلا فاقتله وكن مكانه، فقد وليتك الامرة. (البداية)**

(و في رواية) ثم إن عبيد الله بعث شمر بن ذي الجوشن فقال: اذهب فإن جاء الحسين وأصحابه على حكمي وإلا فمر عمر بن سعد أن يقاتلهم، فإن تباطأ عن ذلك فاضرب عنقه ثم أنت الامير على الناس.

(و في الاستيعاب) فلما التقيا قال له الحسين اختر مني إحدى ثلاث إما أن ألحق بثغر من الثغور وإما أن أرجع إلى المدينة وإما أن أضع يدي في يد يزيد بن معاوية فقبل ذلك عمر منه وكتب به إلى عبيد الله فكتب إليه لا أقبل منه حتى يضع يده في يدي فامتنع الحسين فقاتلوه فقتل معه أصحابه وفيهم سبعة عشر شابا من أهل بيته ثم كان آخر ذلك أن قتل (الاستيعاب)

فقال الحسين: يا عمر، اختر مني إحدى ثلاث: إما تتركني أرجع، أو تسيرني إلى يزيد، فأضع يدي في يده فيحكم في ما يرى، فإن أبيت فسيرني إلى الترك فأقاتلهم حتى أموت . فأرسل عمر بذلك إلى ابن زياد، فهم أن يسيره إلى يزيد، فقال شمر بن ذي الجوشن: لا، أيها الأمير، إلا أن ينزل على حكمك . فأرسل إليه؛ فقال الحسين: والله لا أفعل ، وأبطأ عمر عن قتاله، فأرسل إليه ابن زياد شمرا، وقال: إن تقدم عمر وقاتل وإلا فاقتله، وكن مكانه (الوافي بالوفيات)

It is for this reason that shaitaani hypocrites have made great efforts to keep this statement of Hadhrat Husein ﷺ hidden from the public eye, either by branding the narrator of the incident as unreliable, or by fabricating statements attributed to Hadhrat Husein ﷺ, which show a different meaning, or by just branding the incident as unacceptable, without giving any reason for its denial, except that only a coward could have uttered such a statement, and Hadhrat Husein ﷺ was no coward.

Due to the importance of this narration, especially in exposing the lies behind the shaitaani version of Karbala, a discussion regarding the strength of this narration is essential, which shall Insha-Allâh, now follow:

The statement of Hadhrat Husein ﷺ, in which he agreed to pledge allegiance to Yazîd, this can be found in practically all the major works on Islâmic history. For example, Tabari has narrated it in his Târikh, Ibn Kathir has narrated it in Al-Bidâyah, Ibn-e-Abdul Barr has mentioned it in Al-Istee'aab, Safdi in Al-Waafi, as well as many others. However, as mentioned previously, a narration merely appearing in numerous history books does not really increase its strength, since it is quite possible that all are narrating from the same one source. If that one source is unreliable, hundreds narrating it thereafter shall do nothing in making it reliable. To find the strength of a narration, its chain of narrators has to be studied, and only after that can some verdict be passed.

Below shall follow a few of the chains, through which Hadhrat Husein ﷺ's statement has been narrated:

1) Hafiz Mizzi, in Tahzeebul-Kamaal, and Hafiz Zhahabi in Siyar-an-Nubala, has narrated this statement, from Hadhrat Husein ﷺ's

grandson, Abu Ja'far, Muhammad ibn Ali ibn Husein, , through the following narrators[94]:

'Abu Walid, Ahmed ibn Janaab Maseesi, who narrates from Khalid ibn Yazîd Qisri, who narrates from Ammaar ibn Abi Muawiyah, Dhuni, who narrates from Hadhrat Husein's grandson, Abu Ja'far, Muhammad ibn Ali'

All the narrators of the above tradition have been termed as reliable, except for Khalid ibn Yazîd Qisri[95].

2) Allâmah ibn Kathir, in Al-Bidâyah[96], has narrated the above statement of Hadhrat Husein, through the following chain:

Abu Ubeid Qasim ibn Salaam, who narrates from Hajjâj ibn Muhammad (A'war), who narrates from Abu Ma'shar (Najeeh ibn Abdur Rahmaan), who narrates from some of his elders

Abu Ubeid and Hajjâj ibn Muhammad are not only regarded as reliable narrators, but in fact Imams in the field of narrating[97]. As for Abu

---

[94] وقال أبو الوليد أحمد بن جناب المصيصي حدثنا خالد بن يزيد بن أسد بن عبد الله القسري قال حدثنا عمار بن أبي معاوية الدهني قال قلت لأبي جعفر محمد بن علي بن الحسين عليه السلام حدثني بقتل الحسين عليه السلام حتى كأني حضرته (تقريب التهذيب)

[95] أحمد بن جناب بفتح الجيم وتخفيف النون بن المغيرة المصيصي أبو الوليد صدوق من العاشرة مات سنة ثلاثين م د س (تقريب التهذيب – ابن حجر)

خالد بن يزيد بن أسد القسري عن إسماعيل بن أبي خالد قال ابن عدي لا يتابع على رواياته (المغنى للذهبي)

عمار بن أبي معاوية الدهني بضم المهملة وسكون الهاء ثم نون صدوق من الثامنة عخ م ل س (تقريب التهذيب – ابن حجر)

محمد بن علي بن الحسين بن علي بن أبي طالب أبو جعفر الباقر ثقة فاضل من الرابعة مات سنة بضع عشرة ع (تقريب التهذيب – ابن حجر)

[96] وقال أبو عبيد القاسم بن سلام: حدثني حجاج بن محمد عن أبي معشر عن بعض مشيخته. ...فقال له الحسين: يا عمر اختبرني إحدى ثلاث خصال، إما أن تتركني أرجع كما جئت، فإن أبيت هذه فسيرني إلى يزيد فأضع يدي في يده فيحكم في ما رأى، فإن أبيت هذه فسيرني إلى الترك فأقاتلهم حتى أموت. فأرسل إلى ابن زياد بذلك، فهم أن يسيره إلى يزيد، فقال شمر بن ذي الجوشن: لا ! إلا أن ينزل على حكمك

Ma'shar, he has been described as 'one of the vessels of knowledge', due to his vast knowledge regarding Islâmic history. His memory has been criticized slightly, due to certain errors he made in narrating chains of transmission. Regarding his honesty in narrating, Imam Ahmed ibn Hanbal and Abu Zur'aa have termed him as 'Sadooq' (truthful).[98]
Thus, the only issue that can be raised with this chain is that the names of those Abu Ma'shar has narrated from has not been mentioned, even though the word 'from some of his elders' does lend indication that he had heard this narration from those who he constantly narrated from, and trusted.

The summary of the above is that the incident of Hadhrat Husein ﷺ agreeing to pledge allegiance to Yazîd has been narrated with chains, which for historical purposes, is indeed quite strong. Together with the above, indication towards these three options, i.e. returning to Madinah Munawwara; moving into the wilderness and engaging in Jihaad against the Turks; or pledging allegiance to Yazîd in Shâm, indication towards these options can easily be noticed in other narrations as well.

One example of such an indication is what has been narrated by Hafiz Ibn Asakir in Târikh-e-Dimishq, that the last request made by Hadhrat Husein ﷺ before being martyred was that he be allowed to proceed to Yazîd. His exact words were:

فدعوني آتي أمير المؤمنين

---

[97] أبو عبيد القاسم بن سلام : قال أحمد بن حنبل: أبو عبيد أستاذ، وهو يزداد كل يوم خيرا، وسئل يحيى بن معين عنه فقال: أبو عبيد يسأل عن الناس. وقال أبو داود: ثقة مأمون (تذكرة الحفاظ للذهبي)

حجاج بن محمد الحافظ أبو محمد المصيصي الأعور أحد الأثبات: قال ابن معين: كان أثبت أصحاب ابن جريج (تذكرة الحفاظ للذهبي)

[98] نجيح بن عبد الرحمن أبو معشر السندي مولى بني هاشم عن المقبري والقرظي ونافع وعنه ابن مهدي وسعيد بن منصور قال أحمد صدوق لا يقيم الإسناد وقال ابن معين ليس بالقوي وقال ابن عدي يكتب حديثه مع ضعفه (الكاشف فى معرفة من له رواية فى الكتب الستة– الذهبي)

'Then allow me to proceed to Ameerul-Mumineen.[99]'

This statement of his has been narrated through a very strong chain of narrators, which is as follows:

أخبرنا أبو غالب أحمد بن الحسن أنا عبد الصمد بن علي أنا عبيد الله بن محمد بن إسحاق أنا عبد الله بن محمد بن عبد العزيز حدثني أحمد بن محمد بن عيسى نا عمرو بن عون أنا خالد عن الجريري عن عبد ربه – أو غيره

Ibn Asakir narrates from Abu Ghalib, Ahmed ibn Hasan (Banna)[100], who has been termed as 'the leading scholar of hadith in his time, in Baghdad. He narrates from Abdus Samad ibn Ali (ibn Ma'mun), who has also been described as the leading scholar of hadith in Baghdad, during his era[101]. He narrates from Ubeidullah ibn Muhammad ibn Ishaq, who has been described as 'a leading authority in hadith'[102]. He narrates from Abdullâh ibn Muhammad ibn Abdul Aziz, who has been described as the leading scholar of hadith of his era[103]. He narrates from Ahmed ibn Muhammad ibn Isa (Barti), who has been described as a hafiz of Ahâdith[104]. He narrates from Amr ibn Aun, who has been

---

99 أن الحسين بن علي لما أرهقه السلاح وأخذله السلاح قال ألا تقبلون مني ما كان رسول الله (صلى الله عليه وسلم) يقبل من المشركين قالوا وكان رسول الله (صلى الله عليه وسلم) يقبل من المشركين قال إذا جنح أحدهم قبل منه قالوا لا قال فدعوني أرجع قالوا لا قال فدعوني آتي أمير المؤمنين فأخذ له رجل السلاح فقال له أبشر بالنار فقال بل إن شاء الله برحمة ربي عز وجل وشفاعة نبيي (صلى الله عليه وسلم) فقتل وجئ برأسه حتى وضعه في طست بين يدي ابن زياد فنكته بقضيبه وقال لقد كان غلاما صبيحا ثم قال أيكم قاتله فقام الرجل فقال أنا قتلته فقال ما قال لك فأعاد الحديث فاسود وجهه لعنه الله (تاريخ ابن عساكر)

100 الشَّيْخُ الصَّالِحُ، الثِّقَةُ، مُسْنِدُ بَغْدَادَ، أَبُو غَالِبٍ أَحْمَدُ ابنُ الإِمَامِ أَبِي عَلِيٍّ الحَسَن بن أَحْمَدَ بنِ عَبْدِ اللهِ بن البَنَّاء البَغْدَادِيّ ... وَكَانَ مِنْ بَقَايَا الثِّقَات (سير اعلام النبلاء)

101 ابْنُ المَأْمُوْنِ عَبْدُ الصَّمَدِ بنُ عَلِيِّ بنِ مُحَمَّدٍ الهَاشِمِيُّ الشَّيْخُ، الإِمَامُ، الثِّقَةُ، الجَلِيْلُ، المُعَمَّرُ، أَبُو الغَنَائِمِ عَبْدُ الصَّمَدِ بنُ عَلِيِّ بنِ مُحَمَّدِ بنِ الحَسَنِ بنِ الفَضْلِ بنِ المَأْمُوْنِ بنِ الرَّشِيْدِ الهَاشِمِيُّ، العَبَّاسِيُّ، البَغْدَادِيُّ، شَيْخُ المُحَدِّثِيْنَ بِبَغْدَادَ (سير اعلام النبلاء)

102 ابْنُ حَبَابَةَ عُبَيْدُ اللهِ بنُ مُحَمَّدٍ البَغْدَادِيُّ الشَّيْخُ، المُسْنِدُ، العَالِمُ، الثِّقَةُ، أَبُو القَاسِمِ عُبَيْدُ اللهِ بنُ مُحَمَّدِ بنِ إِسْحَاقَ بنِ سُلَيْمَانَ بنِ حَبَابَةَ – بِالتَّخْفِيْفِ – البَغْدَادِيُّ، المَتُّوثِيُّ، البَزَّازُ (سير اعلام النبلاء)

103 البَغَوِيُّ عَبْدُ اللهِ بنُ مُحَمَّدِ بنِ عَبْدِ العَزِيْزِ ابْنِ المَرْزُبَانِ بنِ سَابُوْرَ بنِ شَاهِنْشَاه، الحَافِظُ، الإِمَامُ، الحُجَّةُ، المُعَمَّرُ، مُسْنِدُ العَصْرِ (سير اعلام النبلاء)

104 البِرْتِيُّ أَبُو العَبَّاسِ أَحْمَدُ بنُ مُحَمَّدِ بنِ عِيْسَى القَاضِي، العَلاَّمَةُ، الحَافِظُ، الثِّقَةُ، أَبُو العَبَّاسِ أَحْمَد بن مُحَمَّدِ بنِ عِيْسَى بن الأَزْهر البِرْتِي، البَغْدَادِيّ، الحَنَفِيّ العَابِد (سير اعلام النبلاء)

described as an 'Imaam' in the field of Ahâdith[105]. He narrates from Khalid (Hazza'), who has been described as an 'Imaam' in this field and a 'hafiz' of Ahâdith[106]. He narrates from Jureiri, who also has been described as an 'Imaam' in the field of hadith[107]. At this point there is a slight doubt whether Jureiri narrates from Abd-e-Rabbi, who has been described as reliable by Imam Ahmed ibn Hanbal[108], or from someone else.

When one ponders over the men mentioned in this sanad, he shall find practically all to be narrators of the highest standard. In Siyar A'laam An-Nubalaa, Hafiz Zahabi has made mention of each of these narrators separately, describing each one with the highest of praises. The only issue with this sanad is at the end, where slight doubt is shown whether the final narrator is Abd-e-Rabbi or someone else.

The fact that Hadhrat Husein ﷺ himself agreed to go to Shâm and pledge allegiance to Yazîd, that was definitely going to create a thorn in the shia description of what happened on that fateful day, thus we find that from the very beginning shaitaani hypocrites went out of their way to ensure that this incident never becomes famous, despite its strength being much more than most of the narrations commonly mentioned when discussing Karbala.

The crux of the shia effort to discredit this narration can be condensed in two points, viz.

---

105 عَمْرُو بنُ عَوْنِ بنِ أَوْسِ بنِ الجَعْدِ السُّلَمِيُّ (خ، د) الحَافِظُ، المُجَوِّدُ، الإِمَامُ، أَبُو عُثْمَانَ السُّلَمِيُّ، الوَاسِطِيُّ، البَزَّازُ (سير اعلام النبلاء)

106 خَالِدُ بنُ مِهْرَانَ أَبُو المُنَازِلِ البَصْرِيُّ الحَذَّاءُ (ع) الإِمَامُ، الحَافِظُ، الثِّقَةُ، أَبُو المُنَازِلِ البَصْرِيُّ، المَشْهُوْرُ: بِالحَذَّاءِ، أَحَدُ الأَعْلاَمِ. رَأَى: أَنَسَ بنَ مَالِكٍ (سير اعلام النبلاء)

107 الجُرَيْرِيُّ أَبُو مَسْعُوْدٍ سَعِيْدُ بنُ إِيَاسٍ (ع) الإِمَامُ، المُحَدِّثُ، الثِّقَةُ، أَبُو مَسْعُوْدٍ سَعِيْدُ بنُ إِيَاسٍ الجُرَيْرِيُّ، البَصْرِيُّ، مِنْ كِبَارِ العُلَمَاءِ (سير اعلام النبلاء)

108 عَبْدُ رَبِّهِ بنُ سَعِيْدٍ الأَنْصَارِيُّ (ع) وَثَّقَهُ: أَحْمَدُ بنُ حَنْبَلٍ. وَقَالَ يَحْيَى القَطَّانُ: كَانَ حَيَّ الفُؤَادِ، وَقَّاداً (سير اعلام النبلاء)

1) Shaitaani hypocrites invented their own narrations in which the willingness of Hadhrat Husein ﷺ to proceed to Shâm was totally denied.
2) The credibility of Umar ibn Sa'd (the son of Hadhrat Sa'd ibn Abi Waqqâs ﷺ) was attacked, since he was the main narrator of the proposal of Hadhrat Husein ﷺ. To discredit him, shaitaani propagandists left no stone unturned in having him declared as the killer of Hadhrat Husein ﷺ, and then propagating this to such an extent that it soon became 'gospel truth', despite so much of evidence proving his innocence from this act.

With regards to the first effort, i.e. inventing contradictory narrations, one example of that is what Abu Mikhnaf (a famous shia narrator and a great liar) would falsely narrate from Abdur Rahmaan ibn Jundub, from Uqbah ibn Sam'aan, the wording of which is as follows[109]:

'I accompanied Husein ﷺ from Makkah until his death. By Allâh, during that journey, he did not utter a word, except that I heard it. ***__He never asked permission to proceed to Yazîd, so that he could place his hands in his hands__****, nor did he ask to be sent to the Islâmic frontier, rather all that he asked was that he be allowed to return from where he had come, or that he be allowed to wander in the open lands, so that he could see the outcome of Yazîd's rule and thereafter make a decision.'*

Wherever one finds Abu Mikhnaf narrating, one can be sure to find plenty of exaggeration, at times vivid lies and some sort of attack on some personality or the other. For this reason the masters of the science of scrutinizing narrators were practically unanimous that the narrations of Abu Mikhnaf not be trusted. Yahya ibn Maeen described

109 وقد روى أبو مخنف: حدثني عبد الرحمن بن جندب، عن عقبة بن سمعان. قال: لقد صحبت الحسين من مكة إلى حين قتل، والله ما من كلمة قالها في موطن إلا وقد سمعتها، وإنه لم يسأل أن يذهب إلى يزيد فيضع يده إلى يده، ولا أن يذهب إلى ثغر من الثغور، ولكن طلب منهم أحد أمرين، إما أن يرجع من حيث جاء، وإما أن يدعوه يذهب في الارض العريضة حتى ينظر ما يصير أمر الناس إليه. (البداية)

him as ‘unreliable.’[110]Ibn Adi in Al-Kamil has described him as a staunch shia, whose narrations are not worth mentioning, especially due to his habit of criticizing the pious predecessors.[111] Abu Haatim Raazie would not narrate from him and Dar-e-qutni termed him as ‘weak’. Hafiz Zahabi summed up his reality in one word, i.e. ‘(هالك) one that has destroyed himself’, which means that he was from the worst of narrators.[112] Hafiz ibn Hajar has described him as a narrator of history who can never be trusted. In fact, when Abu Haatim Raazi was asked regarding Abu Mikhnaf, he replied in astonishment, ‘Is there even a need to ask regarding him!’ What he meant was that his unreliability is so vivid, that the need to enquire regarding him should not even arise.[113]

Another issue with Abu Mikhnaf was that he a staunch supporter of the shia movement against the Ummayyads, and actually even died for this corrupt movement[114]. On this basis too, one would find it necessary that all his narrations regarding Karbala and its aftermath be looked at with suspicion.

---

110 أبو مخنف ليس بشئ وفي موضع آخر ليس بثقة حدثنا محمد حدثنا عباس قال سمعت يحيى قال أبو مخنف وأبو مريم وعمر بن شمر ليسواهم بشئ قلت ليحيى هما مثل عمر بن شمر قال هما شر من عمرو بن شم (الضعفاء للعقيلي)

111 وهذا الذي قاله بن معين يوافقه عليه الأئمة فإن لوط بن يحيى معروف بكنيته وباسمه حدث بأخبار من تقدم من السلف الصالحين ولا يبعد منه ان يتناولهم وهو شيعي محترق صاحب أخبارهم وإنما له من الأخبار المكروه الذي لا أستحب ذكره (الكامل في ضعفاء الرجال)

112 لوط بن يحيى أبو مخنف ساقط تركه أبو حاتم وقال الدارقطني ضعيف و قال الذهبي: أبو مخنف هو لوط بن يحيى هالك (المغني للضعفاء للذهبي)

113 لوط بن يحيى أبو مخنف اخبارى تالف لا يوثق به تركه أبو حاتم وغيره وقال الدارقطني ضعيف وقال يحيى بن معين ليس بثقة وقال مرة ليس بشيء وقال بن عدى شيعى محترق صاحب اخبارهم وقال أبو عبيد الآجري سألت أبا حاتم عنه ففض يده وقال أحد يسأل عن هذا وذكره العقيلي في الضعفاء (لسان الميزان)

114 Abu Mikhnaf was killed in the seventy forth year after Hijrah, fighting along Suleiman ibn Sard, one of the leaders in the war of ‘Revenge for the Ahle-Bait’ a movement initiated by the infamous group known as the ‘Tawwabeen’, who were in fact the very liars who had the Ahle-Bait (the family of Hadhrat Husein رضي الله عنه) martyred.

Thus, had Abu Mikhnaf been the only problem with this narration, that itself would have been sufficient to have it rendered baseless. Together with the above however is the issue with the wording of the narration itself, especially this portion, *'I accompanied Husein from Makkah until his death. By Allâh, during that journey, he did not utter a word, except that I heard it*'. If these words were true, it would demand that Uqbah ibn Sam'aan be present, at the side of Hadhrat Husein, right until his death, whereas, according to what history has narrated, there were many instances during this journey when Hadhrat Husein was alone with the women of his family. Also, in the majority of events recorded regarding Karbala, no mention has been made of this man, whereas if he was a permanent companion in every occasion, in every decision, and in every discussion, which is quite improbable, his name would surely have been mentioned much more than just in a few places.

Thus, after having proven the first sentence being narrated from Uqbah ibn Sam'aan to be an open exaggeration, or a lie, how could one thereafter entertain the possibility that the rest of his narration is true!
From the above one can easily realize the status of the narrations of Abu Mikhnaf, and that it holds hardly any weight in refuting what Umar ibn Sa'd would narrate, regarding Hadhrat Husein's willingness to pledge allegiance at the hands of Yazîd. A point which can however be learnt from his narration is that during his time (which was just after the death of Hadhrat Husein) the word was already going around that Hadhrat Husein had, at the very end of his life, expressed his willingness to proceed to Yazîd and pledge allegiance. This was obviously going to create huge thorns in the shaitaani propaganda, and thus the need arose for Abu Mikhnaf to forge narrations refuting it totally.

a) As for the second attempt of shaitaani forces, i.e. to discredit the reliability of Umar ibn Sa'd, shaitaani hypocrites left no stone unturned in painting him as 'the evil butcher/killer'

responsible for the death of Hadhrat Husein ﷺ. By having the Ummah regard him as evil, there would obviously be no question of anyone ever regarding his narration of Hadhrat Husein being prepared to pledge allegiance to Yazîd, as reliable.

Their efforts in this regard did reap some fruits and certain great authorities in the field of scrutinizing narrators ended up branding Umar ibn Sa'd as unreliable, solely due to his 'assumed inhumane acts' on the field of Karbala. For example, when Yahya ibn Maeen was asked regarding Umar ibn Sa'd, he replied, 'How can a man ever be considered as reliable after having killed the grandson of Rasulullâh ﷺ?!

Despite the fact that Umar ibn Sa'd was from the very beginning right till the end in the frontline of trying to salvage the situation and bring about a peaceful result in the affair between Hadhrat Husain and Yazîd, shaitaani hypocrites succeeded to a great extent in portraying him as the villain of the plains of Karbala, whereas the reality is something completely different. As previously mentioned, the first villain to be pinpointed in this entire episode is none other than Mukhtaar ibn Ubeid Thaqafi, whereas his name is hardly to be found in any of the basic booklets written regarding Karbala! Why? The answer is clear. In the episode of Karbala, due to it being narrated and depicted almost entirely by shaitaani hypocrites, the truthful and innocent have been framed, and the guilty have been made to disappear from the scene completely.

Just as how proving the innocence of Yazîd was never the actual purpose of this book, but rather to expose how much of the common story of Karbala really conforms with what actually happened on that fateful day, so too is the case with Umar ibn Sa'd. It is not our responsibility to prove that he is to be completely absolved from all responsibility, however if we were to accuse him and brand him guilty, than it would be necessary that we have valid proof to substantiate our

claim. If we are unable to do so, the obvious demand of the Shariah would then be that a believer gives his fellow believer the benefit of the doubt, as per Quranic guidance, viz.

لَوْلَا إِذْ سَمِعْتُمُوهُ ظَنَّ الْمُؤْمِنُونَ وَالْمُؤْمِنَاتُ بِأَنْفُسِهِمْ خَيْرًا

'Why do the believers, when they hear an accusation, not think good of their own people,
i.e. other believing men and women'

In the next few lines, a little time shall be spared to describe Umar ibn Sa'd, thereby enabling the reader to view Umar ibn Sa'd, the supposed killer of Hadhrat Husein رضي الله عنه, from a different angle.

When one flips through the pages of history, conflicting accounts come to the fore regarding this man, some showing him to be a wretched, blood-thirsty, fame and money loving villain, prepared to even spill the blood of the grandson of Rasulullâh ﷺ, merely to fulfil his worldly base desires, whereas in the very next few lines, being narrated from another source, one finds this very individual pushing every rock possible to avert calamity falling upon the family of Rasulullâh ﷺ. A few examples of this shall now be presented:

- In the pages that have passed, mention had been made that when Muslim ibn Aqeel رضي الله عنه found himself abandoned by the so-called supporters of Hadhrat Husein رضي الله عنه, the only person that he felt could be trusted with the responsibility of conveying his message to Hadhrat Husein رضي الله عنه, a message upon which rested the life of Hadhrat Husein رضي الله عنه and the Ahle-Bait, was Umar ibn Sa'd. And as expected, Umar ibn Sa'd ensured that he had the entire message conveyed. (By way of reminder, a portion of what has already been mentioned shall be repeated:

'Muslim ibn Aqeel رضي الله عنه first asked Umar ibn Sa'd to pay back on his behalf the loans he had taken in Kufa, which equaled to about one thousand dirhams. The second request was that Umar ibn Sa'd

request from Ibn Ziyaad that he does not mutilate his body. The third request, which was the most important, was that Umar ibn Sa'd send a message to Hadhrat Husein ﵁, warning him of the impending danger. The wording of the message, that Muslim ibn Aqeel ﵁ asked to be conveyed to Hadhrat Husein, was as follows:

> *'Send a message to Husein ibn Ali ﵁ informing him of my condition, <u>and the plight I have ended up in, due to the deception of those who claim to be your helpers</u>. Inform him of how 18 000, who had pledged allegiance at my hands, have suddenly broken their allegiance! Beg him to please return to the Haram (Makkah Mukarramah or Madinah Munawwara) and to remain there, <u>and to never allow himself to again be deceived by the people of Kufa!'</u>*

- In Iraq, the fact that Umar ibn Sa'd played the biggest role in the death of Hadhrat Husein ﵁, that was at one time, due to intense shaitaani propagation, regarded as 'absolute truth'. As time passed, another version did come to the fore, but very few were the ones who would be prepared to discard what they had always known and look at the event again in the light of new information received.
- The statement of Yahya ibn Ma'een, while describing Umar ibn Sa'd, is sufficient to understand the extent of propaganda, regarding this individual, that had, in his time already filtered throughout Iraq. His words were:

'The people of Iraq say that the one who had killed Husein ﵁ was none other than Umar ibn Sa'd.
Ibrahim ibn Sa'd however would deny this and narrate a statement showing that his father was not the killer' (Isti'aab)

- Hafiz A'jali, in his book dealing with 'reliable narrators' (الثقات) has described Umar ibn Sa'd thus:

"A reliable narrator, hailing from Madinah Munawwara, who would narrate Ahâdith of Rasulullâhﷺ, which he had heard from his father (Hadhrat Sa'd ibn Abi Waqqâs), and those who came after would then narrate from him.(It has been said that) he is the one who had killed Hadhrat Husein.

I say, 'He was the Amîr of the army, but played no physical part in the killing.'[115]

- Historical narrations clearly show that Umar ibn Sa'd had no desire to engage in battle with Hadhrat Husein. Rather, when Hadhrat Husein made his proposal, agreeing to one of three things (as mentioned above), Umar ibn Sa'd happily agreed, and wrote to Ubeidullah ibn Ziyaad, seeking his approval. Certain narrations even show Ubeidullah ibn Ziyaad inclining to accept Hadhrat Husein's proposal of allowing him to proceed to Yazîd, but then retracting upon being reprimanded by Shimr ibn Zil-Jaushan. Thereafter, narrations make clear mention that Ubeidullah ibn Ziyaad had Shimr ibn Zil-Jaushan sent over to the battlefield to ensure that Umar ibn Sa'd engages in battle, with the order that if Umar ibn Sa'd is found reluctant, he should be beheaded, and Shimr should take over. (A few examples of such narrations are as follows:

- In Al Bidâyah the following appears:

'Umar ibn Sa'd delayed in launching an attack upon the caravan of Hadhrat Husein. Ubeidullah ibn Ziyaad thus sent Shimr ibn Zil-Jaushan with the command that if Umar ibn Sa'd proceeds forward to attack, then he should allow him to do so. If he is found unwilling, he should be killed and Shimr should take his place.'[116]

---

[115] عمر بن سعد بن أبي وقاص مدني ثقة كان يروي عن أبيه أحاديث وروى الناس عنه وهو الذي قتل الحسين قلت كان أمير الجيش ولم يباشر قتله (الثقات للعجلي)

[116] وبعث عبيد الله بن زياد عمر بن سعد لقتالهم فقال له الحسين يا عمر اختبرنى إحدى ثلاث خصال إما أن تتركنى أرجع كما جئت فان أبيت هذه فسيرنى إلى يزيد فأضع يدى فى يده فيحكم فى ما رأى فان أبيت هذه فسيرنى إلى الترك فأقاتلهم حتى أموت

- Ibn Athir has recorded the following in Usdul-Gabah:

'Some have said that Umar ibn Sa'd had killed Hadhrat Husein, whereas this is totally incorrect. Rather, it was Sinaan ibn Anas Nakha'i who had killed him. As for the statement that Shimr and Umar ibn Sa'd had killed Hadhrat Husein, what was really meant was that Shimr was the one spurring the people on to have Hadhrat Husein killed, and Umar ibn Sa'd was the Amîr of that army, thus the act of killing had been attributed to him.'[117]

- In fact, stronger narrations even show Umar ibn Sa'd being absent from the scene, when the fatal attack upon Hadhrat Husein was made. Imam Bukhâri has narrated the following in his Târikh:

'Muhammad ibn Miswar[118] *has narrated from Qareen ibn Ibrahim that he heard Umar ibn Sa'd proposing to Hadhrat Husein one of three options, either that he return......*

He (i.e. Qareen) then said, 'I was with Umar ibn Sa'd when the announcement was made that Husein had been martyred. At that time we were taking a bath at the Euphrates river.'[119]

Imam Bukhâri thereafter comments that Nuh Al-Muadib[120] (a reliable narrator) had narrated this to him, saying that Ibrahim ibn Sa'd (a most reliable narrator[121]) had narrated this to him.

فأرسل إليه ابن زياد بذلك فهم أن يسيره إلى يزيد فقال شمر بن ذى الجوشن لا إلا أن ينزل على حكمك فأرسل إلى الحسين بذلك فقال الحسين والله لا أفعل وأبطأ عمر عن قتاله فأرسل ابن زياد شمر بن ذى الجوشن وقال له إن تقدم عمر فقاتل وإلا فاقتله وكن مكانه فقد وليتك الامرة (البداية)

117 وقيل: قتله عمر بن سعد، وليس بشيء، والصحيح أنه قتله سنان بن أنس النخعي. وأما قول من قال: قتله شمر وعمر بن سعد، لأن شمر هو الذي حرض الناس على قتله وحمل بهم إليه، وكان عمر أمير الجيش، فنسب القتل إليه (اسد الغابة)

118 a reliable narrator, the grandson of Hadhrat Abdur Rahmaan ibn Auf

119 محمد بن مسور عن قرين بن إبراهيم سمع عمر بن سعد قال لحسين بن علي اختر إحدى ثلاث أما أن ترجع قال فأنا مع عمر نغتسل بالفرات إذ قيل قتل الحسين عليه السلام قاله نوح المؤدب (التاريخ الكبير للبخاري)

120 نوح بن يزيد بن سيار المعلم ويقال المؤدب من أهل بغداد يروى عن إبراهيم بن سعيد روى عنه أبو قدامة ومحمد بن يحيى وأهل العراق (الثقات لابن حبان)

The sanad through which the above has been narrated is indeed quite strong, yet amazingly contradicting incidents, with practically no sanad or very weak sanads, have become more well-known. This is indeed something note-worthy in this entire chapter, i.e. if the event had to be looked at in the light of strong narrations, an entirely different picture shall emerge, as compared to what is presently 'common-knowledge' regarding the affair of 'Karbala'. This can be seen when one investigates the role of Umar ibn Sa'd in the death of Hadhrat Husein, as well as in the incidents that followed immediately thereafter, especially with regards to Yazîd's conduct with the head of Hadhrat Husein, when it was presented in front of him, and his conduct with the Ahle-Bait, when they were brought in front of him. (Details of this shall Insha-Allâh soon be mentioned).

- To end the discussion regarding Umar ibn Sa'd, it would be wise to ponder over a few statements and actions of Umar ibn Sa'd, during and after the calamity of Karbala, which also lends clear indication that this was not a man desirous of the blood of the grand-son of Rasulullâh, but was rather an army lieutenant who found himself in a quagmire, between obedience to the rule of those appointed by the caliph and between the love of the Ahle-Bait, which every believing soul has been blessed with. On the one hand he could not rebel against the command coming from above, while on the other hand he understood well that if Hadhrat Husein refused to submit, he would be forced to raise the sword against him. Umar ibn Sa'd also realised that Shimr ibn Zil-Jaushan was intent on having blood spilled, thus as long as he could, he regarded it wiser to keep the reigns of leadership in his hands and comply with the command of Ubeidullah ibn Ziyaad. The statements that shall follow clearly show that it was Umar ibn Sa'd's desire to somehow avert battle, and when that hope was lost, he found

[121] إبراهيم بن سعد بن إبراهيم بن عبد الرحمن بن عوف الحافظ الإمام أبو إسحاق الزهري المدني (تذكرة الحفاظ)

himself with no other option but to have Hadhrat Husein ﷺ arrested, and taken to Ubeidullah ibn Ziyaad.

This final point, for some reason, has always gone unnoticed, which is that just as how Umar ibn Sa'd had arrested Muslim ibn Aqeel, and not killed him, here too, had Umar ibn Sa'd been present during the fatal attack upon Hadhrat Husein ﷺ, he would never have allowed that he ﷺ be killed, as long as the possibility existed that Hadhrat Husein ﷺ could be taken alive. The shaitaani forces were well aware of this, and for their plans to later materialize, it was essential that Hadhrat Husein ﷺ not be taken alive.

As for Umar ibn Sa'd, neither was he initially eager to meet Hadhrat Husein ﷺ on the battle-field, nor did he ever take pleasure thereafter in the outcome of what had occurred. Rather, from the very second that he saw the mutilated body of Hadhrat Husein ﷺ, he expressed his displeasure with the outcome of the incident.

The few sentences that shall now be mentioned shall, Insha-Allâh, open many eyes to the points made above:

a) Initially Hadhrat Husein ﷺ had refused to hand himself over to Yazîd, but later, after realizing that hypocrites of Iraq had pulled him ﷺ into a trap and had deserted him ﷺ in his most needed hour, Hadhrat Husein ﷺ called Umar ibn Sa'd over, and expressed his willingness to allow himself to be taken to Yazîd. As mentioned previously, this offer was finally turned down by Ubeidullah ibn Ziyaad, due to the pressure of Shimr ibn Zil-Jaushan. The point worthy of note however, is the eagerness with which Umar ibn Sa'd sent the proposal, hoping that the matter could somehow be solved and fighting avoided. The news of Ibn Ziyaad not accepting caused him great pain, which he made apparent during the battle, when asked by Hur ibn

Yazîd as to how could such a proposal be refused. His reply at that moment was[122]:

أما والله لو كان الامر إلى لفعلت ولكن أميرك قد أبى ذلك

"By Allâh, had I been in charge, I would have surely accepted. Rather it is your Amîr that does not want to accept!

b) As mentioned previously, Umar ibn Sa'd, despite being present when the initial attack was launched, was absent when the fatal attack upon Hadhrat Husein رضي الله عنه took place. Had he been present, he would have insisted that Hadhrat Husein رضي الله عنه be arrested and would never have allowed him رضي الله عنه being murdered. During his absence the hypocrites who were there to ensure that Hadhrat Husein رضي الله عنه be killed, took advantage of the situation. First they martyred Hadhrat Husein رضي الله عنه and looted most of his and his family's possessions. They then proceeded to the bed upon which lay Hadhrat Husein رضي الله عنه's twenty-three year old[123], ill son, Ali ibn Husein رضي الله عنه, known famously as Zainul-Aabideen.

Humeid ibn Muslim tried his best to keep them away from Zainul-Aabideen, but it was only upon the arrival of Umar ibn Sa'd that they dispersed. Describing this, Tabari narrates from Humeid ibn Muslim the following[124]:

---

[122] ثم إن الحر بن يزيد لما زحف عمر بن سعد قال له أصلحك الله مقاتل أنت هذا الرجل قال إى والله قتالا أيسره أن تسقط الرؤس وتطيح الايدى قال أفما لكم في واحدة من الخصال التى عرض عليكم رضى قال عمر بن سعد أما والله لو كان الامر إلى لفعلت ولكن أميرك قد أبى ذلك (تاريخ الطبري)

[123] وَأَخْبَرَنَا مُصْعَبٌ ؛ قال : كان عَلِيّ بن الْحُسَيْن مع أبيه يَوْم قُتِلَ وهو ابن ثلاث وعِشْرِيْنَ سنة ، فَلَمَّا قُتِلَ الْحُسَيْن ؛ قال عُمَر بن سَعْدٍ : لا تَعَرَّضُوا لهذا المريض ، وكان عَلِيّ بن الْحُسَيْن مريضًا ، ومَاتَ عَلِيّ بن حُسَيْن وهو ابن ثمان وخَمْسِيْن سنة ، (تاريخ ابن ابي خيثمة)

[124] عن حميد بن مسلم، قال، انتهيت إلى علي بن الحسين بن علي الأصغر وهو منبسط على فراش له، وهو مريض، وإذا شمر بن ذي الجوشن في رجالة معه يقولون: ألا نقتل هذا؟ قال: فقلت: سبحان الله! أنقتل الصبيان! إنما هو صبي؛ قال: فما زال ذلك دأبي أدفع عنه كل من جاء حتى جاء عمر بن سعد، فقال: ألا لا يدخلن بيت هؤلاء النسوة أحد، ولا يعرضن لهذا الغلام المريض،

“I (Humeid ibn Muslim) reached the tent of Hadhrat Ali and found Ali ibn Husein ill, lying upon a bed. I heard Shimr ibn Zil-Jaushan saying to his men, ‘Why have we not as yet killed this one?’ I exclaimed, SubhanAllâh! Do you wish to kill a child? I continued pushing them back until Umar ibn Sa’d arrived. Seeing the situation, he immediately ordered that none should enter the tent in which the women were present and that the ill youngster be left alone. He also ordered that all the looted possessions be returned, but nothing was brought back. ***Ali ibn Husein at that time thanked Umar ibn Sa’d, saying, May you be rewarded, for verily your words have saved us from great danger!’***

What becomes clear from the above narration is that Shimr ibn Zil-Juashan and his band of thugs were not merely fighting to suppress a possible uprising, but were rather carrying out a satanic attack upon the innocent family members of Hadhrat Husein. Their motive and mission was to ensure that none of the male members of the Ahle-Bait remain alive, even if they posed no possible threat to the government. As for Umar ibn Sa’d, from the very beginning he was desirous of averting the need for battle, and when it unfortunately did occur, at that time too his desire was merely to have the noble members of the Ahle-Bait brought under arrest. Having them slain was far from what he ever imagined was going to occur. Thus, as soon as he reached the tent of Hadhrat Husein he expressed lament over what he saw, and he ordered that all attacks stop immediately. Certain narrations make mention that he even had a force loyal to him appointed to guard the living inhabitants of the tent, and protect them from any further attack.[125]

ومن أخذ من متاعهم شيئاً فليرده عليهم. قال: فوالله ما رد أحد شيئاً؛ قال: فقال علي بن الحسين: جزيت من رجل خيراً! فوالله لقد دفع الله عني بمقالتك شراً (تاريخ الطبري)

[125] The unfortunate aspect of this narration is that Tabari had only recorded this narration from Abu Mikhnaf, the shia famous for polluting narrations with his poisonous short additions. Here too Abu Mikhnaf ensured that before ending the

c) From this very same Humeid ibn Muslim, who kept the forces of Shimr back until the arrival of Umar ibn Sa'd, it has been narrated that after the battle he approached Umar ibn Sa'd, who was a close friend of his, and asked regarding his well-being. Umar ibn Sa'd replied,

"Do not ask regarding me, for verily none could ever return home with such a calamity, as that with which I am returning with. I have cut extremely close ties and have taken part in a major calamity!"[126]

d) In the Târikh of Ibn Asaakir[127], the following has been narrated from Abu Mikhnaf, whose narrations as a general rule shall

---

narration some sort of poison be added, due to which one shall find in the next few lines of this narration a completely different Umar ibn Sa'd, as compared to the one described in the lines just before. To end the narration and ensure that no sympathy gets lent to Umar ibn Sa'd, Abu Mikhnaf concludes the narration by saying that after leaving the tent, he had it surrounded by his loyal men, to ensure no further attack. Umar ibn Sa'd then summoned his horsemen and ordered that they first trample the blessed body of Hadhrat Husein ﷺ before severing his ﷺ head. (May Allah protect all from such filthy acts) After what has been described of Umar ibn Sa'd, it seems quite far-fetched that he could ever stoop to such a level, and merely trusting upon the words of a renowned shia liar, i.e. Abu Mikhnaf, to blindly accept this as true and have Umar ibn Sa'd labelled as a demon in human disguise, this is indeed far from the demands of justice! And Almighty Allah alone knows best and He alone guides towards that which is correct.

126 وروي عن حميد بن مسلم قال: كان عمر بن سعد لي صديقا، فأتيته عند منصرفه من قتال الحسين، فسألته عن حاله، فقال: (لا تسأل عن حالي، فإنه ما رجع غائب إلى منزله بشر مما رجعت به، قطعت القرابة القريبة، وارتكبت الأمر العظيم

127 قال أبو مخنف حدثني المجالد بن سعيد الهمداني والصقعب بن زهير أنهما التقيا مرارا ثلاثا أو أربعا حسين وعمر بن سعد قال فكتب عمر بن سعد إلى عبيدالله بن زياد أما بعد فإن الله قد أطفا النائرة وجمع الكلمة وأصلح أمر الأمة فهذا حسين قد أعطاني أن يرجع إلى المكان الذي منه أتى أو أن نسيره إلى ثغر من الثغور فيكون رجلا من المسلمين له ما لهم وعليه ما عليهم أو أن يأتي أمير المؤمنين يزيد فيضع يده في يده فيرى فيما بينه وبينه رأيه وفي هذا لكم رضى وللأمة صلاح قال فلما قرأ عبيدالله الكتاب قال هذا كتاب ناصح لأميره مشفق على قومه نعم قد قبلت قال فقام إليه شمر بن ذي الجوشن فقال أتقبل هذا منه وقد نزل بأرضك وإلى جنبك والله لئن رحل من بلادك ولم يضع يده في يدك ليكونن أولى بالقوة والعز ولتكونن أولى بالضعف والعجز فلا تعطه هذه المنزلة فإنها من الوهن ولكن لينزل على حكمك هو وأصحابه فإن عاقبت فأنة ولي العقوبة وإن غفرت كان ذلك لك

always include some sort of allegation and poisonous attack against the Ahle-Sunnah. Those narrations of his without any such slander and accusations could perhaps be considered, but to be fair, it would be appropriate that none of his narrations be used to prove any point. The narration mentioned above and below are thus being mentioned merely as a conclusion to what has already been proven, and not as a proof itself.

Abu Mikhnaf narrates from Mujaalid ibn Saeed and Saq'ab ibn Zuheir that Hadhrat Husein ﷺ and Umar ibn Sa'd met three or four times to discuss their matter. Umar ibn Sa'd thereafter wrote to Ubeidullah ibn Ziyaad, 'Verily Almighty Allâh has extinguished the flames of in-fighting and has brought about unity. Husein ﷺ has agreed to return from where he has come, or to proceed to the borders of the Islâmic state and join the Muslim forces protecting the Islâmic borders, or to proceed to Yazîd and pledge allegiance at his hands and let Yazîd decide regarding him. In this there is great goodness for the Ummah and it is exactly what you want.

When Ibn Ziyaad read the letter, he said, 'This is a letter, containing good advices for the Amîr. Indeed I have accepted his request! Hearing this, Shimr ibn Zil-Jaushan stood up and said, 'Are you going to accept this? By Allâh, if he does manage to escape from this land, without first pledging allegiance at your hands, his strength shall surely increase and yours shall decrease. Accepting his request is a sign of weakness from your side. Rather, order that he submit to your decision. Thereafter, if you choose to punish him, so indeed he is deserving of punishment. And if you choose to forgive, then that is in your hands. By Allâh, I have received news that Husein and Umar ibn Sa'd have spent a great amount of time together, discussing their plans! Ubeidullah ibn Ziyaad

---

والله لقد بلغني أن حسينا وعمر بن سعد يجلسان بين العسكرين فيتحدثان عامة الليل فقال له ابن زياد نعم ما رأيت الرأي رأيك

(تاريخ دمشق)

acceded to Shimr's advice and said, 'Your opinion is indeed worthy of acceptance!'

Summary of the discussion regarding Umar ibn Sa'd

In the above discourse regarding the credibility of Umar ibn Sa'd, many lessons can be learnt, especially with regards to how quick man is to pass judgement upon individuals, based merely upon oft-repeated narrations and tales, yet when the narrations are dissected, many a time a completely different version of events emerge, which reveals the flaws of the judgement and leave the 'self appointed judge' hiding his head in shame. This lesson however, only he shall learn who has been blessed with the bounty of 'justice' and has been saved from the sickness of 'prejudice' and 'emotional judgements'.

As for the narrations of Umar ibn Sa'd, in which mention has been made of Hadhrat Husein ﷠ ultimately showing willingness to pledge allegiance to Yazîd, which was in fact the actual purpose of this discussion, from these narrations a great deal can be learnt regarding how Hadhrat Husein ﷠ viewed his cousin, Yazîd. Had Yazîd really been the drunkard, transgressor, renegade, etc, as depicted in shia-influenced narrations, Hadhrat Husein ﷠ would have never agreed to pledge allegiance!

Thereafter, when one accepts that Hadhrat Husein ﷠ had no personal grudge against Yazîd, the question shall resurface as to why then did Hadhrat Husein ﷠ proceed to Iraq. If one now finds himself unable to provide a satisfactory answer to this question, it would then only be fair that the answer provided in this booklet be considered, which is that this fight was based solely upon an Ijtihâd Ikhtilaafi issue (difference in reasoning, with both views based upon Islâmic principles).

Hadhrat Husein ﷠ felt the need to bring the caliphate back to the family of the Banu Hashim, and having not as yet pledged allegiance to

Yazîd, he was fully entitled to fight for this felt need. Heﷺ was not on a mission to remove any tyrant, drunkard, etc, but rather his journey was to find an army ready to support him in his mission, an army who had not as yet pledged allegiance to the new government. Based upon the false letters of the hypocrites of Iraq, in which promises were made that such an army was eagerly awaiting hisﷺ arrival in Iraq, Hadhrat Huseinﷺ set out in that direction. When heﷺ finally did realise that the letters were fake, and that the promises were lies, heﷺ now felt it best to abandon his quest to take back the caliphate, and enter into allegiance with the new government, as his other friends of Hijaaz had done. Unfortunately, the hypocrites of Iraq had at this stage reached too far in their plans, and were easily able to ensure that Hadhrat Huseinﷺ never be allowed to reach Yazîd.

As for Yazîd, due to the great distance between Shâm and Iraq, his Ijtihâd would obviously be based upon the reports he would be receiving from men who held senior posts in his cabinet. When even a man like Hadhrat Aliﷺ failed to recognise the scores of hypocrites amongst hisﷺ army, except until they exposed themselves under the banner of the 'Khawârij', how then could one ever blame Yazîd for not being able to differentiate between true and false reports, especially when it concerned matters occurring thousands of miles away?

Many statements, expressions and actions of Yazîd, before and after the incident of Karbala, lend clear indication that his war with Hadhrat Huseinﷺ had nothing to do with enmity, but rather was an Ijtihâdi error, due to it being based upon news received from hypocrite quarters.

The battle of Karbala and its after-math

As with most of the issues regarding the lead-up to Karbala, where nothing definite can be deduced, due to the vast collection of lies and exaggeration that has always surrounded it, so too is the issue with the

battle itself. Prior to the battle and on the day of the fatal battle itself, many sermons were delivered, many discussions were held, and many statements were made, which had they been recorded in an authentic manner, would have shed much more light on who really was responsible for the massacre of Karbala, and what was the true motive behind it. Unfortunately, Divine Wisdom did not allow that to happen, and shaitaani forces were allowed to write their own version of history regarding this great calamity. Despite this, historians did still manage to gather statements and narrations showing an entire different chain of events, but as mentioned previously, these narrations have always been kept hidden in the pages of history, as though they never existed.

It is not my intention to prove that only these narrations be accepted which portray the event of Karbala different to what is normally known. Rather, the purpose of drawing light to these narrations is merely to show that when contradictory statements in every issue of Karbala can be found, what then shall the basis of accepting and rejecting be? Why is it that whatever shows Yazîd guilty and evil, only those narrations are considered and narrations showing the opposite are immediately rejected, without any bother of even viewing its chain of narrators?

What really happened?
Stage One: The battle itself......

Sad and emotional scenes have always been painted of the fateful battle of Karbala, which ended in the martyrdom of Hadhrat Huseinؓ and hisؓ entire caravan of men. Besides the woman in the tents, Hadhrat Zainul-Aabideenؓ, and one slave, no other member of the caravan of Hadhrat Huseinؓ survived. From these, perhaps only the slave was present on the field the day Hadhrat Huseinؓ was martyred.

Yet, when one reads about the battle, expecting that very little be known regarding it, due to the absence of survivors, one amazingly

finds the reporting of the incident explicit to the finer detail. Was it the lone slave that was able to freely move around the battle-field and record the different scenes that occurred on that fateful day, or was there perhaps some other force working in drawing up a tearful, sorrowful picture of blood, oppression and torment?

It is obvious that when none, except one slave, from the caravan of Hadhrat Husein ﷺ lived to explain the true happenings of the 10th of Muharram, the only source that could have been narrating it would either be the very men who had come out to fight against Hadhrat Husein ﷺ, or people who had never witnessed the battle. Whatever the case may be, such narrators can never be gauged as reliable, due to them either not being first-hand witnesses, and if they were, then due to the doubt that falls upon their integrity, that after having themselves taken part in the slaying of Hadhrat Husein ﷺ and his caravan, what suddenly made them repent? When they could not be trusted before the battle, what then transformed them now into reliable, trustworthy narrators? Also, when one takes part in a battle, he naturally endeavours to conceal the errors of his party, whereas here we find the opposite, i.e. fighters describing their own acts of aggression and violence in such a manner, as though their desire was naught, but to bring the anger of the entire Ummah against the Caliphate of the Ummayyads.

Stage Two: In the court of Yazîd

Scenes of the wives and daughters of Hadhrat Husein ﷺ being dragged, without any consideration to their modesty, across the vast plains of Iraq, until arriving finally at Yazîd's palace in Shâm; then being presented in a shameless manner in front of the caliph, and then having to witness Yazîd, boldly and mockingly scratch the noble, blessed face of Hadhrat Husein ﷺ, etc; such scenes have become so entrenched in the minds of many, that had they to hear that the possibility of these incidents not having occurred at all not only exists,

but rather seems most probable, many, I am sure, shall desire nothing but to tear up the papers that dare make such a claim. Indeed, it is only the share of a few, who shall afford themselves time to reinvestigate the matter, and allow themselves the opportunity to view all angles justly.
If you are one such person, then the following narrations shall surely be sufficient to make you understand that many issues regarding Karbala have never been thoroughly investigated, whilst numerous statements of unknown or unreliable narrators have been treated as though they are ‘authentic’, without any question and need for further verification.

What happened when the news of the outcome of Karbala reached Yazîd?

The following narrations may help in answering that question...

a) Ubeidullah ibn Ziyaad wrote to Yazîd ibn Muawiyah, informing him of what had occurred and seeking his counsel with regards to the children of Husein ﵁ and the women of his ﵁ caravan. When the news reached Yazîd, he cried and said,

‘O people of Iraq! I would have been more than pleased with your submitting to my rule, without the need to have Husein killed! This then is the result of rebelling and disobedience!
May Allâh curse Ibn Marjaana (i.e. Ubeidullah ibn Ziyaad)! Just because Husein was not his close family (he found no need to show mercy!) By Allâh! Had I been there, I would have surely pardoned Husein. May Allâh show mercy to Husein![128]

[128] كتب عبيد الله بن زياد إلى يزيد بن معاوية يخبره بما حدث ويستشيره في شأن أبناء الحسين ونسائه فلما بلغ الخبر يزيد بن معاوية بكى وقال: . " كنت أرضى من طاعتكم . أي أهل العراق . بدون قتل الحسين، كذلك عاقبة البغي والعقوق لعن الله ابن مرجانة لقد وجده بعيد الرحم منه، أما والله لو أني صاحبه لعفوت عنه فرحم الله الحسين وفي رواية أنه قال:... أما والله لو كنت صاحبه، ثم لم أقدر على دفع القتل عنه إلا ببعض عمري لأحببت أن أدفعه عنه (الدولة الاموية)

b) Yazîd thereafter sent a reply to Ubeidullah ibn Ziyaad[129], ordering that the captives be sent to him. Zakwaan Abu Khalid had ten thousand dirhams given to them, (i.e. the family of Hadhrat Husein ﵁), **with which they could prepare for the journey.**

c) The following has been narrated from a man of the tribe of Himyar, Ghaaz ibn Rabeiah Jurashi[130]:

By Allâh, I was in Damascus with Yazîd ibn Muâwiyah when Zuhr ibn Qais[131] arrived. Yazîd questioned him as with regards to what had

---

[129] فجاء رد يزيد على ابن زياد يأمره بإرسال الأسارى إليه، وبادر ذكوان أبو خالد فأعطاهم عشرة آلاف درهم فتجهزوا بها، ومن هنا يعلم أن ابن زياد لم يحمل آل الحسين بشكل مؤلم أو أنه حملهم مغللين، كما ورد في بعض الروايات، وقد مر معنا كيف أن ابن زياد قد أمر للأسارى بمنزل منعزل وأجرى عليهم الرزق والنفقة وكساهم. (الدولة الاموية)

[130] قال هشام فحدثنى عبد الله بن يزيد بن روح بن زنباع الجذامى عن أبيه عن الغاز بنن ربيعة الجرشى من حمير قال والله إنى لعند يزيد بن معاوية بدمشق إذ أقبل زحر بن قيس فدخل على يزيد فقال له يزيد ويحك ما وراءك فقال أبشر يا أمير المؤمنين بفتح الله عليك ونصره ورد علينا الحسين بن على بن أبى طالب وثمانية عشر من أهل بيته وستون رجلا من شيعته فسرنا إليهم فسألناهم أن يستسلموا وينزلوا على حكم الأمير عبيد الله بن زياد أو القتال فاختاروا القتال فغدونا إليهم مع شروق الشمس فأحطنا بهم من كل ناحية حتى أخذت السيوف مأخذها من هام القوم فجعلوا يهربون إلى غير مهرب ولا وزر ويلوذون منا بالآكام والحفر لواذا كما لاذ الحمام من صقر فوالله ما كانوا إلا حزر جزر أو نومة قائل حتى أتينا على آخرهم فهاتيك أجسادهم مجردة وثيابهم مزملة وخدودهم معفرة تصهرهم الشمس وتسفى عليهم الريح زوارهم العقبان والرخم قال فدمعت عينا يزيد بن معاوية وقال كنت أرضى من طاعتكم بدون قتل الحسين لعن الله ابن سمية أما والله لو أنى صاحبه لعفوت عنه ورحم الله الحسين ولم يصل الذى جاء برأسه بشيء ولما وضع رأس الحسين بين يدي يزيد قال أما والله لو أنى صاحبك ما قتلتك ثم أنشد قول الحسين بن الحمام المرى الشاعر ... يفلقن هاما من رجال أعزة ... علينا وهم كانوا أعق وأظلما (البداية)

[131] Historians have generally given the name of the man who came with the head of Hadhrat Husein ﵁ as Zuhr ibn Qais Al-Ju'fi. Ibnul-Adeem has expressed his reservations about whether this too is authentic, since Zuhr ibn Qais Al-Ju'fi was a man very close to Hadhrat Ali ﵁ and to Hadhrat Hasan ﵁, and was regarded as a noble man of his tribe. For such a man to bring the blessed head of Husein ﵁ in the manner described above, and to say what has been quoted above, that indeed seems quite far-fetched. Either another man having the same name had brought it, which made historians mistakenly assume that it was this very Zuhr Al-Ju'fi, or perhaps, as with many aspects of

happened at Karbala. He replied, 'Glad tidings, O Leader of the faithful! Allâh has aided you and blessed you with victory. Husein ibn Ali came upon us with seventeen of his family members and seventy of his devout followers. We asked them to surrender to the decision of the Amîr, Ubeidullah ibn Ziyaad, or else to be prepared to fight. They chose to fight.

Just as the sun was rising, we attacked them from all sides and our swords had its full share in severing the necks of many of them. They then tried to flee, but in vain. In a very short space of time, the battle came to an end, with their bodies burning under the scorching sun, with winds blowing across, and vultures pecking at their bodies.'

***As the eyes of Yazîd swelled with tears**, he said, 'I would have been pleased with your submitting (o people of Iraq) without the need to have Husein ibn Ali killed. **May Allâh curse Ibn Sumayya (Ubeidullah ibn Ziyaad)! By Allâh, had I been there, I would surely have forgiven Husein! May Almighty Allâh shower His mercies upon Husein.**'*
*Yazîd gave no reward to the man who brought the head of Hadhrat Husein ؓ to him. When the head was placed in front of Yazîd, Yazîd remarked, **'By Allâh! Had I been there, I would never have killed you!***

Yazîd thereafter recited the following from the poetry of Husein ibn Hammaan:

يفلقن هاما من رجال أعزة ... علينا وهم كانوا أعق وأظلما

*'He severs the heads of men, **who are indeed most beloved to us***
merely due to their disobedience and
unjust attitude with us'

d) Allâmah Haithami has narrated, with a sound chain of narrators, from the great jurist of Islâm, Hadhrat Laith ibn Sa'd, regarding

---

Karbala, the inclusion of this 'name' is also a false allegation against a noble man. And Almighty Allah knows best.

what transpired when the blessed head of Hadhrat Husein رضي الله عنه was brought in front of Yazîd. This narration shows a completely different picture to what is normally narrated, and deserves to be placed at the top of the list of the narrations dealing with this aspect of history.

The unique feature of this narration is that it has been narrated with a sound and strong chain of narrators, right up to Hadhrat Laith ibn Sa'd, which is something quite rare, when it comes to historical narrations. Tabrani has narrated this incident from Abu Zanbaa', who narrates from Yahya ibn Bukeir, who narrates from Laith ibn Sa'd, Both Abu Zanbaa' and Yahya have been declared reliable.

As for Laith ibn Sa'd, his status amongst the illustrious scholars of Islâm is well known. Regarding him, Imam Shafee' said, 'Laith was a greater jurist than even Imam Malik, except that his students did not preserve his teachings.' Imam Ahmed ibn Hanbal said regarding Laith, 'I had seen many, but never had I seen a man like Laith ibn Sa'd!'[132] Hafiz Zhahabi has described Laith ibn Sa'd with the following words:

'[133]Laith ibn Sa'd, the Imam, Hafiz of Ahâdith, Sheikh of Egypt and its leader'

Laith ibn Sa'd was born about thirty years after the martyrdom of Hadhrat Husein رضي الله عنه, thus the narration which shall now be mentioned was obviously not what he had himself witnessed, but rather what he would be narrating from one of his seniors. Narrators like Laith ibn Sa'd would only leave out mentioning the name of the one they had heard from when they were sure of his narration being reliable. If not, they would clearly make mention of his name, so that the responsibility to

---

[132] نقل أبو حاتم بن حبان، عن الشافعي، رضى الله عنه، أنه قال: كان الليث بن سعد أفقه من مالك، إلا أنه ضيعه أصحابه . و قال أحمد: رأيت من رأيت، فلم أر مثل الليث (تهذيب الأسماء واللغات للعلامة أبى زكريا محيي الدين بن شرف النووي)

[133] الليث بن سعد الإمام الحافظ شيخ الديار المصرية وعالمها ورئيسها (تذكرة الحفاظ)

prove the authenticity of their narration does not rest upon their shoulders.

The narration of Laith ibn Sa’d is as follows[134]:

‘Husein ibn Aliﷺ refused to be taken captive and fell as a martyr, fighting against the forces of Ubeidullah ibn Ziyaad. He and his companions were martyred at a place called ‘Tuff’.

Ali ibn Husein, Fatimah bint Husein and Sakeena bint Husein were taken as captive and presented in front of Ibn Ziyaad.

*Ali ibn Husein had just turned mature. From there they were sent to Yazîd ibn Muâwiyah, who ordered that Sakeenah be placed at the back, **attempting thereby to prevent her eyes falling upon the sight of the blessed head of her father, Huseinﷺ, as well as upon her male family members, especially Ali ibn Huseinﷺ, who were in chains.***

(Note: This last sentence, if correct, makes clear indication that chains were placed upon the surviving men of the caravan of Hadhrat Huseinﷺ, **and not upon the women**. End Note)

When the head was placed in front of Yazîd, he tapped at the teeth of Huseinﷺ and recited the following couplets:

‘We sever the heads of men, who are indeed most beloved to us
merely due to their disobedience and unjust attitude with us’

Hearing this, Ali ibn Huseinﷺ spoke out, reciting the verse:

---

[134] حدثنا أبو الزنباع روح بن الفرج المصري ثنا يحيى بن بكير حدثني الليث قال – يعني ابن سعد – قال : أبى الحسين بن علي أن يستأسر فقاتلوه فقتلوه وقتلوا بنيه وأصحابه الذين قاتلوا معه بمكان يقال له : الطف وانطلق يعلى بن حسين وفاطمة بنت حسين وسكينة بنت حسين إلى عبيد الله بن زياد وعلي يومئذ غلام قد بلغ فبعث بهم إلى يزيد بن معاوية فأمر بسكينة فجعلها خلف سريره لئلا ترى رأس أبيها وذوي قرابتها وعلي بن حسين في غل فوضع رأسه فضرب على ثنيتي الحسين فقال : نفلق هاما من رجال أحبة . . إلينا وهم كانوا أعق وأظلما فقال علي بن حسين : { ما أصاب من مصيبة في الأرض ولا في أنفسكم إلا في كتاب من قبل أن نبرأها إن ذلك على الله يسير } . فثقل على يزيد أن يتمثل ببيت شعر وتلا علي ابن الحسين آية من كتاب الله عز و جل . فقال يزيد : بل بما كسبت أيديكم ويعفو عن كثير . فقال علي : أما والله لو رآنا رسول الله صلى الله عليه و سلم مغلولين لأحب أن يخلينا من الغل . فقال : صدقت فخلوهم من الغل . فقال : ولو وقفنا بين يدي رسول الله صلى الله عليه و سلم على بعد لأحب أن يقربنا . قال : صدقت فقربوهم . فجعلت فاطمة وسكينة يتطاولان لتريا رأس أبيهما وجعل يزيد يتطاول في مجلسه ليستر رأس الحسين ثم أمر بهم فجهزوا وأصلح إليهم وأخرجوا إلى المدينة (رواه الطبراني ورجاله ثقات) مجمع الزوائد

ما أصاب من مصيبة في الأرض ولا في أنفسكم إلا في كتاب من قبل أن نبرأها
إن ذلك على الله يسير

'Whatever afflicts one, either in the lands or within one himself, it has all been recorded and pre-destined.
Verily that for Almighty Allâh is most easy!

Yazîd felt a pinch that after using poetry to describe the situation, a young lad had answered him with a verse of the Noble Quraan. Yazîd thus also read a verse:

(بل) بما كسبت أيديكم ويعفو عن كثير

'(Rather, this is) due to what your hands have earned, and indeed Almighty Allâh forgives plenty!

Ali ibn Husein then said, "Listen, had Rasulullâh seen us in this condition, he would surely have desired that our chains be removed! Yazîd replied, "You are correct", and ordered that their chains be immediately taken off. Ali ibn Husein continued, "By Allâh, had we been standing in front of Rasulullâh at such a distance, he would surely have desired that we be brought closer. Yazîd again accepted and ordered that they be brought forward.

Fatima and Sakeena then began raising their necks, to have a closer look at the blessed head of their illustrious father. Noticing this, Yazîd attempted stretching out his body, in order to somehow obscure their view. Yazîd then gave orders that preparations be made for their journey home. ***Yazîd himself saw to all their needs and affairs until finally they left for Madinah Munawwara.*** (Majmauz-Zawaaid)

e) Yaafi'ee has quoted from Hafiz Abul-Alaa Hamdani that when the blessed head of Hadhrat Husein was brought in front of Yazîd, he sent a message to Madinah Munawwara, summoning the freed slaves of the Banu Hashim. When they arrived, he joined with them many of the freed slaves of Abu Sufyaan, and with this party was the blessed head as well as the surviving

family of Hadhrat Husein ﷺ sent. **Yazîd made every possible arrangement to make the journey comfortable and ordered that their every need in Madinah Munawwara be fulfilled.** (Miraatul Jinaan)[135]

f) Allâmah Zarkali, in his monumental work, 'Al A'laam, while discussing the life of Hadhrat Husein's daughter, Fatimah, has quoted the following incident[136]:

'When her father (Hadhrat Husein) was martyred, she was taken to Shâm, together with her sister, Sakeenah, and her two aunts, Umme Kulthum bint Ali and Zainab bint Aqeel. When they came in front of Yazîd, she (Fatimah) said,

'O Yazîd, are the daughters of Rasulullâh ﷺ going to be treated as captives?' Yazîd immediately replied, 'Rather, they are free and noble! Enter upon your cousins (i.e. the women of the household of Yazîd). Fatima said,

'I entered upon the woman of the house of Yazîd, and did not find a single one of them, except that she was mourning the death of Hadhrat Husein.

Discussing the issue of Yazîd, Allâmah ibn Taimiyyah has written the following[137]:

---

135 واختلف الناس أين حمل الرأس المكرم من البلاد وأين دفن،فذكر الحافظ أبو العلاء الهمداني أن يزيد حين قدم عليه رأس الحسين بعث إلى المدينة فأقدم عليه عدة من موالي بني هاشم،وضم إليهم عدة من موالي أبي سفيان،ثم بعث ينتقل رأس الحسين ومن بقي من أهله،وجهزهم بكل شيء ولم يدع لهم حاجة إلا أمر لهم بها،وبعث برأس الحسين إلى عمرو بن سعيد بن العاص وهو إذ ذاك عامله على المدينة،فقال عمرو:وددت أنه لم يبعث به إلي ثم أمر عمرو بن سعيد برأس الحسين رضوان.الله عليه فكفن ودفن في البقيع عند قبر أمه فاطمة رضي الله عنها.قال:هذا أصح ما قيل فيه (مرآة الجنان وعبرة اليقظان)

136 ولما قتل أبوها حملت إلى الشام مع أختها سكينة، وعمتها أم كلثوم بنت علي، وزينب العقيلية، فأدخلن على يزيد، فقالت: يا يزيد أبنات رسول الله سبايا ؟ قال: بل حرائر كرام، أدخلي على بنات عمك، فدخلت على أهل بيته، فما وجدت فيهن " سفيانية " إلا نادبة تبكي (الاعلام للزركلي)

137 وأما ما ذكره من سبي نسائه والدوران بهن على البلدان وحملهن على الجمال بغير أقتاب، فهذا كذب، وباطل وماسبى المسلمون . ولله الحمد . هاشمية قط، ولا استحلت أمة محمد صلى الله عليه وسلم هاشمية قط، ولكن أهل الهوى والجهل يكذبون كثيراً.(منهاج السنة النبوية)

‘As for what some have mentioned, that the women of the caravan of Hadhrat Husein﵁ were made captive, and taken around the towns disgracefully, upon camels with no saddles, these narrations are nothing but clear-cut lies and fabrications. By the grace of Almighty Allâh, the Muslim Ummah has never taken a Hashimi woman as a captive, nor have they ever taken one as a slave. It is the ignorant and those drowned in their base desires that have spoken many lies in this regard!’

At another juncture, Ibn Taimiyyah has written[138]:

‘Yazîd ibn Muawiyah, in accordance to what all have narrated, never gave the order that Husein﵁ be killed. All that he did was that he wrote to Ibn Ziyaad ordering that he prevent Hadhrat Husein﵁ from taking over Iraq.

Husein﵁ felt that the people of Iraq would support him﵁, and would fulfil the promises they had made in the letters they had sent to him﵁. He﵁ thus sent his cousin, Muslim ibn Aqeel over to them, but when they had Muslim ibn Aqeel killed and pledged their allegiance to Ibn Ziyaad, Hadhrat Husein﵁ decided to return to Madinah Munawwara.

Unfortunately, an oppressive army of Ibn Ziyaad caught up with him. Hadhrat Husein﵁ requested that he﵁ be allowed to proceed to Yazîd, or to any of the borders of the Islâmic state, or to return to Medina Munawwara, but the army refused and demanded that he hand himself over to be arrested. Hadhrat Husein﵁ refused and in the fighting that followed attained martyrdom.

---

[138] **إن يزيد لم يأمر بقتل الحسين باتفاق أهل النقل ، ولكن كتب إلى ابن زياد أن يمنعه عن ولاية العراق . والحسين– رضي الله عنه – كان يظن أن أهل العراق ينصرونه ويفون له بما كتبوا إليه ، فأرسل إليهم ابن عمه مسلم بن عقيل ، فلما قتلوا مسلما وغدروا به وبايعوا ابن زياد ، أراد الرجوع فأدركته السرية الظالمة ،فطلب أن يذهب إلى يزيد،أو يذهب إلى الثغر،أو يرجع إلى بلده ، فلم يمكّنوه من شيء من ذلك حتى يستأسر لهم ، فامتنع ، فقاتلوه حتى قُتل مظلوما– رضي الله عنه – ، ولما بلغ ذلك يزيد أظهر التوجّع على ذلك ، وظهر البكاء في داره ، ولم يسب له حريما أصلا ، بل أكرم أهل بيته ، وأجازهم حتى ردّهم إلى بلدهم (منهاج السنة النبوية)**

When the news of the killing of Hadhrat Husein ﷺ reached Yazîd, he expressed great remorse over it and his entire household went into mourning. Yazîd never took any of the women of the caravan of Hadhrat Husein ﷺ as captive, rather he honoured them and rewarded them with gifts until their return home.

As for the narrations which appear in the books of the Shia, which show that the women of the Ahle-Bait were disgraced and taken to Shâm as captive and disgraced there as well, these narrations are nothing but lies and fabrications. In fact, the Banu Ummayyah would show great respect to the Banu Hashim.

Imam Ghazali, in explaining why cursing Yazîd should not be deemed permissible, made mention of this very point, i.e. since it has never been established that Yazîd gave the command for Hadhrat Husein ﷺ to be killed, it is not correct to accuse him of the deed. Imam Ghazali writes[139]:

'If one were to ask, 'Is it permissible to curse Yazîd, since he was the killer of Hadhrat Husein ﷺ or at least he was the one who gave the order that he ﷺ be killed?' Our reply shall be, ***'This has never been proven, thus forget cursing him, just to say that Yazîd killed Hadhrat Husein ﷺ or issued the order for him ﷺ to be killed, that too shall not be permissible, since, without proof, to attribute a major sin to a Muslim is not permissible!***

Famous accusations levelled against Yazîd

In an attempt to turn the Ummah against the Ummayyad rule, and to conceal the actual reasons for Hadhrat Husein ﷺ proceeding towards Iraq, many filthy stories and accusations were levelled against Yazîd, all of which, as mentioned above, have never be proven. From these accusations, a few have always headed the list, and thus deserve that some time be taken out for its refutation.

[139] فإن قيل هل يجوز لعن يزيد لأنه قاتل الحسين أو آمر به ؟ قلنا : هذا لم يثبت أصلاً فلا يجوز أن يقال إنه قتله أو أمر به ما لم يثبت ، فضلاً عن اللعنة ، لأنه لا تجوز نسبة مسلم إلى كبيرة من غير تحقيق (احياء العلوم – بيان عظيم خطر اللسان)

Accusation No 1:

The women of the caravan of Hadhrat Husein ﷺ were brought in front of Yazîd in a disgraceful manner

Answer to this accusation:

In what has thus far been mentioned, much of this issue has already been discussed, wherein the following has come to light:

a) When the first news of the martyrdom of Hadhrat Husein reached Yazîd, he cried and expressed anger over why Ubeidullah ibn Ziyaad had not first consulted with him. Yazîd even mentioned that had he been there, he would have surely pardoned Hadhrat Husein. Even if Yazîd was not sincere in this statement of his (as some would want us to believe), then too, no leader, no matter how foolish, will express sorrow and regret over a military error, announcing that he himself would never have done such an act, and immediately thereafter issue an order that the very women whose husbands and sons had just been killed **in this error**, an error which he wished could have been averted, now be disgraced, humiliated, and robbed of their honour and modesty.

b) Try to imagine, in the era of the Ta'bieen, the wives, sisters and daughters of the family of Hadhrat Husein, the most noble women of the Banu Haashim, being paraded around the streets, and being led through Iraq, all the way to the capital of the Muslim state in Shâm, bareheaded, in a most wretched and humiliated condition, with not a single Tabi'ee standing up anywhere along the journey in opposition, not even when they enter the most blessed land of Shâm. Anyone, with a little knowledge of the virtues of the land of Shâm and its people, especially during the era of the Tâbi'een and Tab'e-Tâbi'een would never be prepared to accept that such a thing could ever have occurred.

c) In the narrations that passed above, clear mention was made that chains were never put on the women of the caravan of Hadhrat Husein رضي الله عنه, and that when they arrived in front of Yazîd, his first concern was that the eyes of Hadhrat Husein رضي الله عنه's daughter does not fall upon the sight of the blessed head of her illustrious father, lest it cause her pain. Does it not seem improbable that on one hand a man is disgracing and humiliating a group of women, and at the very same time, he is concerned that their feelings should not be hurt?

d) Mention has already been made that when Yazîd sent the order to Ubeidullah ibn Ziyaad to have the family of Hadhrat Husein رضي الله عنه sent over to him, this order was issued just after Yazîd's crying over the misfortune that had occurred at Karbala. The order that the family be sent immediately, issued after the shedding of tears, would indeed be more likely to be one in which Yazîd's intention was to now make amends for the dreadful calamity that had befallen them, and to offer them his condolence. This point is further proven from the fact that when the women arrived at the dwelling of Yazîd, they found that the people of the house had already begun mourning. When Yazîd's intention was to offer his condolences, would he first have them humiliated and disgraced, and then express his sorrow over their loss?

e) In the narrations that have passed, mention had been made that when the order of Yazîd reached Ubeidullah ibn Ziyaad to have the family of Hadhrat Husein رضي الله عنه sent over to Shâm, a man named Abu Zakwaan Khalid immediately had ten thousand dirhams handed over to them, so that they could make preparations for their journey. If the women were going to be dragged to Shâm in a humiliating manner, what then was the need to hand them such a huge sum of money? Money is given so that items can be purchased to make a journey comfortable. Who bothers to ensure that captives travel comfortably?

In the points mentioned above, it has become quite clear that the narrations portraying the women of the caravan of Hadhrat Husein being dragged, in a humiliating and disgraceful manner all the way to Shâm, are nothing but shaitaani lies and fabrications, intended to enrage the Muslim Ummah against the Ummayyad Caliphate. The fact of the matter is that Yazîd, after hearing of the calamity at Karbala, desired nothing but to immediately have the family of Hadhrat Husein brought over to him, whereby he may share in their sorrow, and allow them to be consoled through the women of his house-hold. Then too, when the women of the caravan of Hadhrat Husein finally appeared in front of Yazîd, despite the efforts made to make their journey comfortable, Yazîd still expressed disappointment when he saw their state, and remarked that had there been that relationship between Ibn Ziyaad and Hadhrat Husein which existed between him and Hadhrat Husein, Ibn Ziyaad would never have sent the women in the condition that he did, i.e. he would have gone to even further lengths in ensuring that their journey be even more comfortable and easy.

Accusation No 2: When the blessed head of Hadhrat Husein was placed in front of Yazîd, he poked at it mockingly, and when a Sahâbi rebuked him saying that he had seen Rasulullâh kissing those very lips of Hadhrat Husein, Yazîd became angry and reprimanded the Sahâbi.

Answer to this accusation:

a) If one were to ponder over the poem that Yazîd read when Hadhrat Husein's blessed head was placed before him, and the tears that he shed at that moment, it would indeed seem very peculiar that one who had just cried and expressed sorrow over the death of a close family member, would the very next second mock and poke at the blessed head of the deceased.

b) The actual reason for many believing that Yazîd mocked at the blessed head of Hadhrat Husein ﵁ is due to a narration mentioned in the Tarikh of Tabari[140], quoting from the infamous Abu Mikhnaf (the shia liar). The narration is as follows:

'A Sahâbi, by the name of Abu Barazah Al-Aslami ﵁ stood up and said, 'Are you poking your stick into the mouth of Husein ﵁, whereas this very mouth has been blessed that the lips of Rasulullâh ﵁ itself touched it!
O Yazîd, you shall appear on the Day of Qiyamah, with Ibn Ziyaad as your intercessor,
whilst Husein ﵁ shall appear with Rasulullâh ﷺ as his ﵁ intercessor!

When one ponders over the narrations in which mention has been made that a Sahâbi ﵁ became irritated when witnessing the blessed head of Hadhrat Husein ﵁ being mockingly poked at by Yazîd, he shall find mention being made of one of two names, viz. Hadhrat Anas ibn Malik ﵁ and Hadhrat Abu Barazah Al-Aslami ﵁.
With regards to these men, Allâmah ibn Taimiyyah writes:

فانّ أبا برزة، وأنس بن مالك، كانا با لعراق لم يكونا بالشام، ويزيد بن معاوية كان بالشام، لم يكن بالعراق
حين مقتل الحسين، فمن نقل أنه نكث بالقضيب بحضرة هذين قدامه
فهو كاذب قطعا، كذبا معلوما بالنقل المتواتر
(راس الحسين – ابن تيمسة)

"It is known without any doubt that Abu Barazah (As-Aslami) ﵁ and Hadhrat Anas ibn Malik ﵁ were in Iraq and not in Shâm, whilst Yazîd ibn Muawiyah was in Shâm, not in Iraq, when Hadhrat Husein ﵁ was martyred. Thus, whosoever narrates that Yazîd ibn Muawiyah poked at the blessed head of Hadhrat Husein ﵁ in the presence of these two

---

[140] **فقال رجل من أصحاب رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم يقال له أبو برزة الاسلمي أتنكت بقضيبك في ثغر الحسين أما لقد أخذ قضيبك من ثغره مأخذا لربما رأيت رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم يرشفه أما إنك يا يزيد تجئ يوم القيامة وابن زياد شفيعك ويجئ هذا يوم القيامة ومحمد صلى الله عليه وسلم شفيعه (البداية ناقلا عن هشام عن أبى مخنف قال حدثنى أبو حمزة الثمالى عن عبد الله الثمالى عن القاسم بن بخيت)**

men, he should be regarded as an open liar, one whose lies have been refuted with tawatur!

Rather, what is known, and what has been narrated with much better and stronger sanads is that this incident actually occurred when the blessed head of Hadhrat Husein ﷻ was placed in front of Ubeidullah ibn Ziyaad. Later, either by mistake, or with evil intent, as shaitaani liars are well known for, this filthy act had been attributed to Yazîd, since he too had used a stick to touch the face of Hadhrat Husein ﷻ, except that his act was done in love, not in mock.

The narrations that show this are as follows:

- Imam Bukhâri[141] narrates from <u>Hadhrat Anas ibn Malik ﷻ,</u> that when the blessed head of Hadhrat Husein ﷻ was brought in front of <u>Ubeidullah ibn Ziyaad</u>, he began poking at it and he said something regarding the handsomeness of the face.

- In the Musnad of Bazzar, with a sound sanad, it has been mentioned that Hadhrat Anas ﷻ rebuked <u>Ibn Ziyaad</u>, saying: 'By Allâh, I shall say something that shall put you to shame. Verily I had seen the blessed lips of Rasulullâh ﷻ on the very spot that you are poking at!' Hearing this, Ibn Ziyaad pulled his hand back.[142]

---

[141] عن أنس بن مالك رضي الله عنه : أتي عبيد الله بن زياد برأس الحسين بن علي عليه السلام فجعل في طست فجعل ينكت وقال في حسنه شيئا (البخاري)

[142] وعن أنس قال : لما أتي عبيد الله بن زياد برأس الحسين جعل ينكت بالقضيب ثناياه يقول : لقد كان – أحسبه قال – جميلا فقلت : والله لأسوءنك إني رأيت رسول الله صلى الله عليه و سلم يلثم حيث يقع قضيبك . قال : فانقبض (رواه البزار والطبراني بأسانيد ورجاله وثقوا)

c) Certain narrations, with a weaker sanad[143], mention that at that very moment Hadhrat Zaid ibn Arqamﷺ spoke out saying, 'Lift up your stick, for verily I had seen the lips of Rasulullâhﷺ on that very spot!'

From the above it has become clear that Hadhrat Anas ibn Malik had rebuked Ibn Ziyaad when he poked at the blessed face of Hadhrat Husein, and not at Yazîd, since he (Hadhrat Anas) was not in Sham at that time. As with regards to Hadhrat Abu Barazah Al-Aslami, what is known for certain, as pointed out by Hafiz Ibn Taimiyyah is that he too was not in Shaam when the blessed head of Hadhrat Husein was brought there. In fact, so much can be said for certain that Hadhrat Abu Barazah Aslami was present in **Iraq**, not Shaam, during the era of Ubeidullah ibn Ziyaad. If he had rebuked anyone with regards to poking at the blessed face of Hadhrat Husein, it would have been Ibn Ziyaad, and not Yazîd.

Imam Bukhâri, in his Târikh-e-Awsat, describing Hadhrat Abu Barazah, has stated:

نضلة بن عبيد أبو برزة الأسلمى نزل البصرة دخل على عبيد الله بعد حسين بن علي رضى الله تعالى عنهما

(التاريخ الاوسط)

Nadlah ibn Ubeid, Abu Barazah Al-Aslami, a resident of Basrah. After the death of Hadhrat Husein he came in the presence of ***Ubeidullah ibn Ziyaad***

Accusation No.3:

Yazîd was an evil man, whose acts of adultery, drinking of liquor, abolishing the Islâmic punishments, keeping wild animals and monkeys as pets, etc, were common knowledge.

Answer:

---

143 عن زيد بن أرقم لما أتي بن زياد برأس الحسين بن علي رضي الله عنهما فجعل ينقر بقضيب في يده في عينه وأنفه قال له زيد ارفع القضيب فلقد رأيت فم رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم في موضعه (المعجم الكبير و فيه حرام بن عثمان و هو متروك)

The first issue that needs to be discussed with regards to these accusations is regarding who had seen Yazîd doing these acts. Merely stating that many books of history have narrations regarding this can in no way be sufficient, especially when it has now become clear that the entire Karbala episode was merely to crush the Ummayyad caliphate. The possibility that these shaitaani forces would be working tirelessly to portray the rulers of the caliphate as evil, merely to instigate the masses against them, now becomes most probable. In the light of the above, the need arises to allow every accusation made against Yazîd to be brought under the spotlight.

Let us accept that which is proven through Shar'ee proofs. What need is there for us to insist that we accept as truth beyond doubt that which fails to stand up in court?

Is this approach of ours not against what Almighty Allâh has asked for in the following verses:

يَا أَيُّهَا الَّذِينَ آمَنُوا إِنْ جَاءَكُمْ فَاسِقٌ بِنَبَإٍ فَتَبَيَّنُوا أَنْ تُصِيبُوا قَوْمًا بِجَهَالَةٍ
فَتُصْبِحُوا عَلَى مَا فَعَلْتُمْ نَادِمِينَ (الحجرات)

O People of Imaan, if a man whose honesty and uprighteousness has not been established, if such a man brings you news, first authenticate it (before accepting and practicing upon its demands), lest you wrongly attack a nation in your ignorance, an act which you shall then have to lament!

With regards to lending an ear to an accusation of adultery, Almighty Allâh says:

لَوْلَا إِذْ سَمِعْتُمُوهُ ظَنَّ الْمُؤْمِنُونَ وَالْمُؤْمِنَاتُ بِأَنْفُسِهِمْ خَيْرًا (النور)

Why is it not that when believing men and women hear such an accusation, they do not think good of their own people?

In fact, if such an accusation had been made against a chaste woman, and she asked for her right, the ones levelling the accusation would

have been ordered to bring forward four just witnesses to back their accusation, failing which they themselves would then be subjected to eighty lashes each.

Almighty Allâh says:

لَوْلَا جَاءُوا عَلَيْهِ بِأَرْبَعَةِ شُهَدَاءَ فَإِذْ لَمْ يَأْتُوا بِالشُّهَدَاءِ فَأُولَئِكَ عِنْدَ اللَّهِ هُمُ الْكَاذِبُونَ (النور)

Why do they not bring forth four witnesses?
If they cannot do so, then they themselves are, in the court of Almighty Allâh, the biggest liars!

Thus, when so much emphasis has been laid when it comes to lending an ear to an accusation, it seems only fair that Yazîd also be allowed this right. Also, let it be understood that asking for an investigation into the accusations levelled against Yazîd, this has nothing to do with love or hatred (Na'ûzubillah) for the Ahle-Bait!

When one studies the narrations spread throughout the books of history, describing Yazîd as a transgressor, adulterer, etc, one shall perhaps find that the prime source of all these narrations is a narration which Tabari has narrated in his Târikh. The narration, with its sanad is as follows[144]:

Yazîd ibn Muawiyah ordered that Walid hand the governorship of Madinah Munawwara over to Uthmaan ibn Muhammad ibn Abi

---

[144] فبعث يزيد بن معاوية إلى الوليد فعزله فيما ذكر أبو مخنف عن عبد الملك بن نوفل بن مساحق عن حميد بن حمزة مولى لبنى أمية وبعث عثمان بن محمد بن أبى سفيان فيما ذكر أبو مخنف عن عبد الملك بن نوفل بن مساحق عن حميد بن حمزة مولى لبنى أمية قال فقدم فتى غر حدث غمر لم يجرب الامور ولم يحنكه السن ولم تضرسه التجارب وكان لا يكاد ينظر في شئ من سلطانه ولا عمله وبعث إلى يزيد وفدا من أهل المدينة فيهم عبد الله بن حنظلة الغسيل الانصاري وعبد الله بن أبى عمرو ابن حفص بن المغيرة المخزومى والمنذر بن الزبير ورجالا كثيرا من أشراف أهل المدينة فقدموا على يزيد بن معاوية فأكرمهم وأحسن إليهم وأعظم جوائزهم ثم انصرفوا من عنده وقدموا المدينة كلهم إلا المنذر بن الزبير فإنه قدم على عبيدالله ابن زياد بالبصرة وكان يزيد قد أجازه بمائة ألف درهم فلما قدم أولئك النفر الوفد المدينة قاموا فيهم فأظهروا شتم يزيد وعتبه وقالوا إنا قدمنا من عند رجل ليس له دين يشرب الخمر ويعزف بالطنابير ويضرب عنده القيان ويلعب بالكلاب ويسامر الخراب والفتيان وإنا نشهدكم إنا قد خلعناه فتابعهم الناس (تاريخ الطبري

Sufyaan. A young inexperienced man thus came over to Madinah Munawwara as governor, one who hardly paid any attention to the needs of the state and to what he had been made responsible over. He (Uthmaan ibn Muhammad) sent a delegation from the people of Madinah Munawwara to Yazîd, amongst whom were Abdullâh ibn Hanzalah ﷺ; Abdullâh ibn Abu Amr ibn Hafs ibn Mugheera Al-Makhzoomi; Munzir ibn Zubeir; and other influential individuals of Madinah Munawwara.

When they came to Yazîd, he showered them with gifts and honoured them greatly. After departing, all returned to Medina Munawwara, except Munzir ibn Zubeir, who proceeded to Basrah, to spend time with Ubeidullah ibn Ziyaad. When these men returned to Madinah Munawwara, they stood up amongst the people and began criticizing and pointing out the faults of Yazîd.

They said, 'We have come from a man, who has no Deen (religion), who drinks liquor, plays with drums, keeps dogs as pets, spends his private time with the rot of society. We thus make you witness that we have broken our allegiance from this man.' After hearing this, the people of Medina Munawwara followed suit.

The problems with this narration:

a) Tabari narrates this incident from Abu Mikhnaf, who narrates from Abdul Malik ibn Naufal, who narrates from Humeid ibn Hamzah. The sad state of Abu Mikhnaf, especially when it comes to lending fuel to shia propaganda, has previously been mentioned. His name appearing in the sanad of this narration is itself more than sufficient reason for this entire accusation to be discarded.

b) Ibn Asakir has also narrated regarding this incident, with a much stronger chain, but in his narration a completely different picture comes to the fore.

Ibn Asakir narrates from[145] Abu-Ghalib, Muhammad ibn Hasan Al-Basari, (a high-ranking, reliable narrator[146]) who narrates from Mubarak ibn Abdul-Jabbar, (also a high ranking, reliable narrator[147]) who narrates from Muhammad ibn Abdul Wahid, (a reliable narrator[148]) who narrates from Ahmad ibn Ibrahim Bazzaz (a very high

---

145 أخبرنا أبو غالب محمد بن الحسن البصري أنا المبارك بن عبد الجبار بن أحمد أنا أبو الحسن محمد بن عبد الواحد بن محمد بن جعفر أنا أحمد بن إبراهيم بن الحسن بن شاذان البزاز نا أبو بكر أحمد بن محمد بن شبيب بن أبي شيبة البزاز أنا أبو جعفر أحمد بن الحارث الخراز أنا أبو الحسن علي بن محمد بن عبد الله بن أبي سيف المدائني عن مسلمة بن محارب عن داود بن أبي هند وعلي بن زيد وعن سلمة بن عثمان وعامر بن حفص عن أشياخ من أهل المدينة وعوانة ويزيد بن عياض قالوا استعمل يزيد عثمان بن محمد بن أبي سفيان على المدينة فلما حضر الموسم كتب إليه يأمره أن يقيم للناس الحج سنة اثنتين وستين ثم قدم المدينة فأقام بها فقال أهل المدينة لعثمان أوفد منا وفدا إلى أمير المؤمنين يعتذر إليه مما بلغه فأوفد عثمان وفدا إلى يزيد من قريش وغيرهم فيهم عبد الله بن جعفر بن أبي طالب وعبد الله بن أبي عمرو بن حفص بن المغيرة المخزومي و رجل من بني عدي من آل سراقة وعثمان بن عطاء بن تويت ومحمد بن عمرو بن حزم الأنصاري وعبد الله بن حنظلة غسيل الملائكة والعباس بن سهل بن سعد الساعدي ومعقل بن سنان الأشجعي فقدموا على يزيد وهو بحوارين فنزلوا على الوليد بن عتبة فأقاموا عشرة أيام لم يصلوا إلى يزيد وانتقل يزيد من حوارين منتزها وشخص الوفد معه فأذن لهم يوم جمعة فدخلوا عليه وعنده الوليد بن عتبة وعمرو بن سعيد ويزيد على سرير ماد رجليه قد غطاهما بسبنية فرحب بهم وتلقاهم ببشر حسن واعتذر إليهم من تركه الإذن لهم عليهم وقال لم أزل وجعا من رجلي إن الذباب ليسقط عليها فيخيل إلي أن صخرة سقطت عليها فقام إليه السراقي وهو شيخ كبير به رعش فدنا منه فسقط عليه فقال اعمدوا الشيخ حاجتك فلم يسأله شيئا إلا أنعم له به وقام إليه العباس بن سهل بن سعد الساعدي فاتكأ على رجله التي شكا يزيد الوجع منها فقطب يزيد من شدة الوجع والعباس يكلمه ويسأله وهو يقول نعم حتى سأله عشرين حاجة ثم قام إليه عثمان بن عطاء بن تويت فقال يا أمير المؤمنين انظر إلى أثر هذا السفيه في ظهري وألقى ثوبه عن ظهره فقال عمرو للوليد بن عتبة هذا عملك أنت أمرته قال لا ما أمرته قال بلى فردد ذلك مرارا فقال الوليد ما أمرته ولا أمرت أهل العراق بإخراج سعيد من الكوفة وكثر القول بينهما فكفهما يزيد وأمر الوفد برفع حوائجهم فلم يسألوا حاجة إلا قضاها ثم وصلهم بعد قضاء حوائجهم وأذن لهم في الانصراف فرجعوا ذامين له مجمعين على خلعه ورجع الوليد بن عتبة إلى المدينة وأقام عبد الله بن جعفر لم ينصرف مع الوفد وقال بعضهم لم يكن عبد الله بن جعفر في الوفد ولكنه قدم إلى يزيد وحده بعد انصراف الوفد إلى المدينة فلم يزل عند يزيد حتى انقضى أمر الحرة (تاريخ ابن عساكر)

146 أبو غالب الماوردي * الشيخ الامام، المحدث الصدوق، أبو غالب محمد بن الحسن ابن علي بن الحسن التميمي البصري الماوردي (سير اعلام النبلاء)

147 ابن الطيوري * الشيخ الامام، المحدث العالم المفيد، بقية النقلة المكثرين أبو الحسين المبارك بن عبد الجبار بن أحمد بن القاسم بن أحمد بن عبد الله البغدادي الصيرفي (سير اعلام النبلاء)

148 محمد بن عبد الواحد بن محمد بن جعفر أبو عبد الله البغدادي البزاز ابن زوج الحرة مكثر روى عنه الخطيب، ووثقه (تاريخ الاسلام للذهبي)

ranking, reliable narrator[149]) who narrates from Abu Bakr, Ahmed ibn Muhammad ibn Abi Shaibah (a high ranking, reliable narrator[150]) who narrates from Abu Bakr, Ahmed ibn Haarith, Kharraz (a high ranking, reliable narrator[151]), who narrates from Abu Ali, Al-Madaa'ini (a very high ranking, reliable narrator, whose historical narrations hold great weight[152]), who narrates from Maslamah ibn Muhaarib (who has been classified as reliable by Ibn Hibbaan).

Maslamah ibn Muhaarib narrates this incident from four men, viz.

1) Dawood ibn Abi Hind (who has been classified as reliable by Ibn Hibbaan)
2) Ali ibn Zaid (the writer has been unable to ascertain the status of this narrator, due to his full name not being known)
3) Salamah ibn Uthmaan (who has been classified as reliable by Ibn Hibbaan)
4) Aamir ibn Hafs (also known as Suheim ibn Hafs, who has been classified as reliable by Ibn Nadeen in his Al-Fahrist[153])

These four narrate from:

1) 'اشياخ من اهل مدينة' 'senior members of Medinah Munawwara'. The names of these seniors have not been given, but in the mere mention that they were 'seniors', this itself lends great indication that their words can be trusted.
2) Awanah (ibn Al-Hakam, who has been classified as reliable by Hafiz Al-A'jeli)

---

149 ابن شاذان * الشيخ الامام، المحدث الثقة المتقن، أبو بكر، أحمد بن إبراهيم بن الحسن بن محمد بن شاذان بن حرب بن مهران البغدادي البزاز (سير اعلام النبلاء)

150 أحمد بن محمد بن شبيب البغدادي البزاز. أبو بكر بن أبي شيبة – وثقه الدارقطني (تاريخ الاسلام للذهبي)

151 أحمد بن الحارث البغدادي. أبو جعفر الخراز) شيخ صدوق (تاريخ الاسلام للذهبي)

152 المدائني * العلامة الحافظ الصادق أبو الحسن علي بن محمد بن عبد الله بن أبي سيف المدائني الاخباري. نزل بغداد، وصنف التصانيف، وكان عجبا في معرفة السير والمغازي والانساب وأيام العرب، مصدقا فيما ينقله، عالي الاسناد (سير اعلام النبلاء)

153 وكان عالما بالأخبار والأنساب والمآثر والمثالب ثقة فيما يرويه (الفهرست)

3) Yazîd ibn I'yaadh (the scholars have termed him as unreliable and some have labelled him as a fabricator of Ahâdith)

This then is the state of the sanad of the narration that is now going to be mentioned. As a historical narration, it indeed seems quite strong, much stronger that what Tabari has narrated from Abu Mikhnaf, since the only major issue is with Yazîd ibn I'yaadh, but as the sanad shows, he is not the sole narrator of this incident. (And Almighty Allâh knows best)

The narration is as follows:

*'Yazîd ibn Muawiyah appointed Uthmaan ibn Muhammad as governor over Madinah Munawwara. When the time of Hajj approached, he ordered that he lead the Hajj. This was in the 62nd year of Hijrah. After Hajj, when Uthmaan ibn Muhammad returned to Madinah Munawwara, the people of Madinah Munawwara requested that a delegation be sent to the Amîr (i.e. Yazîd**) to clarify and explain some issues, the news of which had reached the ears of Yazîd**.*

Uthmaan ibn Muhammad complied and sent a delegation comprising of members from the Qureish, as well as other tribes. Amongst these members were Hadhrat Abdullâh ibn Ja'far; Abdullâh ibn Abi Amr ibn Hafs; a man from Banu Adi', from the Suraaqah tribe; Uthmaan ibn A'ta; Muhammad ibn Amr ibn Hazm; Abdullâh ibn Hanzalah رضي الله عنه; Abbaas ibn Sahl ibn Sa'd رضي الله عنه; and Hadhrat Ma'qil ibn Sinaan رضي الله عنه.

When they reached Shâm, they were hosted by Walid ibn Utbah for ten days, due to Yazîd being at another place, called Huwwareen (a famous area in Damascus). Finally, on the day of Jumu'ah, the delegation got the chance to meet Yazîd, in the presence of Walid ibn Utbah and Amr ibn Saeed. Yazîd welcomed them and sought forgiveness for the delay, explaining that he was at present suffering with severe pain in the leg, so much so that even if a fly were to sit on it, it would feel as though a rock had fallen upon it.

First the old man from the Suraaqah tribe went forward, but due to having a sickness which caused his body to shake, he tumbled and

landed upon the aching leg of Yazîd. (Without showing any anger) Yazîd ordered his minister to fulfil whatever requests the Suraaqi man had. Abbaas ibn Sahl ibn Sa'd stood up next and came forward. (Without realizing) he leaned upon the very leg which was aching, causing Yazîd to shiver in pain. Abbaas ibn Sahl had twenty requests, all of which Yazîd promised to fulfil.

Uthmaan ibn A'ta stood up next. He lifted his upper garment, exposing his back and scars made most probably by a whip. He pointed to Walid ibn Utbah, indicating that he had unjustly ordered that he be whipped. Walid ibn Utbah responded, 'I had never issued such an order, neither had I ever ordered the people of Iraq to remove Saeed (ibn Aas) from Kufa!' The argument continued until Yazîd intervened and ordered both to remain quiet. Yazîd thereafter issued an order that the requests and needs of the delegation be fulfilled.

After granting them all their needs, Yazîd added further gifts from his side and thereafter permitted them to take leave.

The delegation returned, upset with Yazîd and intent on breaking their allegiance. *Walid ibn Utbah returned to Madinah Munawwara and* ***Abdullâh ibn Ja'far chose to remain by Yazîd. (According to one narration, Abdullâh ibn Ja'far ﷺ was not part of the delegation, but rather he ﷺ only reached after the delegation had departed, and he ﷺ thereafter remained with Yazîd, until the war of Harrah.***

From this narration many things can be learnt regarding Yazîd's manner of rule, and the tolerance he showed in his court. This is something that is hardly ever heard regarding Yazîd. Besides this, there are three points indeed worthy of consideration

1) The reason of sending the delegation was mentioned, i.e. 'to clarify and explain some issues, the news of which had reached the ears of Yazîd'. What were these issues? It seems that already in Medinah Munawwara there were some issues regarding Yazîd and his ministers that had upset certain

prominent men of Madinah Munawwara and had made them utter statements, which were thereafter conveyed to Yazîd. This group now wished to be able to speak directly with Yazîd and explain the reasons behind their criticizing his government.

2) When the group left, despite receiving what they received, they were still upset with Yazîd and intent on breaking their allegiance. Why?

The reason could either be what was mentioned in the narration of Tabari, i.e. they had witnessed, **during the one meeting which they had with him, on the day of Jumu'ah**, acts of immorality, drinking of liquor, playing with dogs and monkeys, etc. If this was really the reason, then why would Hadhrat Abdullâh ibn Ja'farؓ, the nephew of Hadhrat Aliؓ, the son of Hadhrat Ja'far At-Tayyaarؓ, after seeing such filth being committed from the seat of Caliphate, still choose to remain with Yazîd after the delegation left, as the narration mentions. Even if it is said that heؓ only came after the delegation, then too the question would arise, that how was it possible for the delegation, in only one meeting, on the day of Jumu'ah, to see such happenings, yet Hadhrat Abdullâh ibn Ja'farؓ, Hadhrat Nu'maan ibn Basheerؓ, and so many other prominent figures, who spent great amounts of time with Yazîd, they had never witnessed such affairs?

The other possibility is that the reason for them being upset with Yazîd had nothing to do with Yazîd's personal life at all, but was rather the very reason for which the delegation had come, i.e. they were not happy with certain ministers and felt Yazîd was not doing enough to address the situation. Thus, in the narration we read that Yazîd gave them whatever they asked, but when the issue of Walid ibn Utbah having unjustly lashed the old man from the Suraaqah tribe was brought up, Yazîd ordered that the matter be left aside. If one were to now ask why did Yazîd not punish Walid for his wrong acts, the answer would be that such accusations against ministers were not uncommon,

rather from the era of Hadhrat Umarرضي الله عنه, ministers were being accused of wrong behaviour, but whenever a thorough investigation would be conducted, a different picture would come to the fore, proving the innocence of the minister. Yazîd was well aware of this and felt that there was no real need to now ask for an investigation, especially since Walid ibn Utbah had already been removed from his post as governor over Madinah Munawwara. (And Almighty Allâh knows best)

This then brings an end to the discussion of the narration of Tabari, quoting from Abu Mikhnaf, wherein Yazîd has been described as an open transgressor.

The fact of the matter is that shaytâni forces, as they had done in the past, and continue doing till today, were working tirelessly in spreading propaganda against Yazîd, in the land of Hijaaz. Those who believed this propaganda cannot be blamed for falling for the trap, since they were not able to see the picture of the various happenings in all the Muslim states at that time, as we see it today. The knowledge and statements that they had made regarding Yazîd would be based on the news that messengers would convey to them. When many messengers would come with the same story, it would only seem correct that one believe it, since why should so many people be speaking lies?

Today however, after it has been made apparent that a shaitaani scheme, spread out throughout the Islâmic lands, was being put in place, to bring an end to the Islâmic Caliphate, in which hypocrites carrying false messages were made to stand up in different areas, giving the impression that the news they were conveying was one hundred percent true, now if one still falls for the shaitaani propaganda of that era, without making any effort to verify the original source of the information, that would indeed be a foolish deed.

In fact, even at the time when the people of Madinah Munawwara, after having heard the shaitaani version of what had happened at

Karbala, and so many reports regarding the evil personality of Yazîd, decided to break their allegiance, prominent members from the Sahâbahؓ and Tâbi'een forbade them doing so, and refused to support them in their act.

Prominent men who refused to break their allegiance to Yazîd

1) Hadhrat Muhammad ibn Hanafiyah, the illustrious son of Hadhrat Aliؓ

Allâmah ibn Kathir narrates the following[154] in Al-Bidâyah, as well as Hafiz Zahabi, in Tareekhul-Islâm

When the delegation of Madinah Munawwara returned from Yazîd, Abdullâh ibn Mutee'ؓ and his companions came to Muhammad ibn Hanafiyah (the son of Hadhrat Aliؓ) and requested that he too break his allegiance to Yazîd.

Ibn Hanafiyah flatly refused to do so. Abdullâh ibn Mutee'ؓ then mentioned that Yazîd is an alcoholic, one who abandons Salaah, and breaks the commands of Almighty Allâh.

Muhammad ibn Hanafiyah replied, 'I had never seen such things, whereas I had spent a good amount of time by Yazîd. Rather, I found him to be punctual with his Salaah, always desirous of good, always

[154] ولما رجع أهل المدينة من عند يزيد مشى عبد الله بن مطيع وأصحابه إلى محمد بن الحنفية فأرادوه على خلع يزيد فأبى عليهم فقال ابن مطيع إن يزيد يشرب الخمر ويترك الصلاة ويتعدى حكم الكتاب فقال لهم ما رأيت منه ما تذكرون وقد حضرته وأقمت عنده فرأيته مواضبا على الصلاة متحريا للخير يسأل عن الفقه ملازما للسنة قالوا فان ذلك كان منه تصنعا لك فقال وما الذى خاف منى أو رجا حتى يظهر إلى الخشوع أفأطلعكم على ما تذكرون من شرب الخمر فلئن كان أطلعكم على ذلك إنكم لشركاؤه وإن لم يطلعكم فما يحل لكم أن تشهدوا بما لم تعلموا قالوا إنه عندنا لحق وإن لم يكن رأيناه فقال لهم أبى الله ذلك على أهل الشهادة فقال إلا من شهد بالحق وهم يعلمون ولست من أمركم فى شيء قالوا فلعلك تكره أن يتولى الأمر غيرك فنحن نوليك أمرنا قال ما أستحل القتال على ما تريدوننى عليه تابعا ولا متبوعا قالوا فقد قاتلت مع أبيك قال جيئونى بمثل أبى أقاتل على مثل ما قاتل عليه فقالوا فمر ابنيك أبا القاسم والقاسم بالقتال معنا قال لو أمرتهما قاتلت قالوا فقم معنا مقاما تحض الناس فيه على القتال قال سبحان الله آمر الناس بما لا أفعله ولا أرضاه إذا ما نصحت لله فى عباده قالوا إذا نكرهك قال إذا آمر الناس بتقوى الله ولا يرضون المخلوق بسخط الخالق وخرج إلى مكة (البداية)

enquiring regarding the Shar'ee law in matters which arose in front of him, a man firm on the Sunnah!'

The group answered that perhaps Yazîd had behaved that way during his stay just to put on a show and deceive him. Muhammad ibn Hanafiyah replied, ***'What reason was there for him to pretend in front of me? He had no reason to fear me, nor did I have anything which he needed from me! What, did Yazîd allow you the opportunity to watch him drinking liquor? If Yazîd had drunk this liquor in your presence, then you are just as guilty, since you took part in the gathering (without making any objection at that time)! And if you were not present, and never personally saw Yazîd drinking liquor, then it is not permissible for you to give witness of what you do not know for certain!'***

The group replied, 'These are known facts, even though we had personally not witnessed it.' Ibn Hanafiyah answered, 'Almighty Allâh has not allowed this. Almighty Allâh states, 'Unless one gives witness of matters one knows for certain!'

The group responded, 'Perhaps you fear that when we choose a new leader, we shall overlook you and choose someone else? We promise that you alone shall be appointed as our leader.' Ibn Hanafiyah replied, 'I do not regard this fight of yours with the caliph as permissible, irrespective whether I am made your leader or I am made a follower.'

The group then asked, 'Then why did you fight with your father (Hadhrat Ali ﷺ) against Hadhrat Muâwiyah?' Ibn Hanafiyah replied, 'Bring someone like my father, and I shall join him, fighting for what my father fought for!' The group then requested that he at least allow his two sons to join them in their fight, to which Ibn Hanafiyah replied that if he felt it right for them to join the fight, he would have himself joined.

Finally the group asked that the minimum he do is to stand and encourage the people to join them in their fight against the caliph. Ibn Hanafiyah replied, 'SubhanAllâh! Do you want that I encourage

towards that which I do not regard as right. If I had to do such a thing, I would not be sincere to Almighty Allâh.'

The group then threatened that they would then force him to say what they wanted. He replied, 'If you do so, I shall stand up and warn the people that they should fear Allâh, and should not please the creation by doing that which displeases the Creator!' Saying this, Ibn Hanafiyah left for Makkah Mukarramah.

Understand well whose testimony this is. Muhammad ibn Hanafiyah is the son of Hadhrat Ali, whose love and respect for his two brothers, Hadhrat Hasan and Hadhrat Husein was unimaginable, and whose piety and bravery was metaphorical. On the plains of Karbala, it was his beloved brother, Hadhrat Husein, and his family members that were martyred. Had he seen or known anything evil of Yazîd, would he ever have concealed it?

From his testimony in favour of Yazîd, together with the accusations of fisq (open transgression, etc) being refuted, another accusation that also gets clearly refuted is the accusation that Yazîd had treated the family of Hadhrat Husein with great disrespect and dishonour, when they were brought to him, after the battle at Karbala. Muhammad ibn Hanafiyah gave this testimony after having heard from his sister, Zainab bint Ali, and his nephew, Zainul-Aabideen (Hadhrat Husein's son) what had transpired on the plains of Karbala, and what treatment they had received at the hands of Yazîd. Had they seen anything evil or had they received any form of ill-treatment from Yazîd, they would surely have mentioned it to him, and he would have at the very least, made some indication towards it in this testimony of his!

For this reason, in the book (بل ضللتَ), written in refutation of Tijaani's filthy book, titled, (ثم اهتديتُ), the author, while refuting the accusations made against Yazîd, writes the following:

أما اتهام يزيد بالفسق وشرب الخمر ، فهذا من الكذب الظاهر ، وندع محمد بن عليّ بن أبي طالب رضي الله عنه يجيب على هذا الادعاء لأنه أقام عند يزيد وهو أدرى به

'As for the slander made against Yazîd, regarding being an open transgressor, drinking liquor, etc, these are nothing but blatant lies. ***And it would seem best that we let Hadhrat Muhammad ibn Ali ibn Abi Talib ﷺ (Muhammad ibn Hanafiyah ﷺ) himself answers these accusations, since he ﷺ had spent time by Yazîd, so he should know better!'***

In fact, during Ibn Hanafiyah ﷺ's stay by Yazîd, an interesting dialogue took place between him and Yazîd, which is indeed worth mentioning:

Balaazari, in Ansaabul-Ashraaf, narrates[155]:

When Muhammad ibn Hanafiyah went to bid farewell to Yazîd, after having spent a considerable amount of time by Yazîd in Damascus, (which occurred after the incident of Karbala, as seen in other narrations), Yazîd, who had showed him great respect all along, asked him the following question,

'O Abul-Qasim, if you have seen any evil trait or unbecoming quality in me, please inform me. I promise that I shall immediately refrain from that and I shall do as you advise.' Ibn Hanafiyah replied, 'By Allâh, had I seen you doing wrong, I would have immediately rebuked you and prohibited you therefrom, for Almighty Allâh has made it obligatory upon the people of knowledge to never conceal the truth! I have not seen from you, but that which is good!'

2) Hadhrat Abdullâh ibn Umar ﷺ, the illustrious son of Hadhrat Umar ﷺ

---

155 روي البلاذري أن محمد بن علي بن أبي طالب – المعروف بابن الحنفية – دخل يوماً على يزيد بن معاوية بدمشق ليودعه بعد أن قضى عنده فترة من الوقت ، فقال له يزيد ، و كان له مكرماً : يا أبا القاسم ، إن كنت رأيت مني خُلُقاً تنكره نَزَعت عنه ، و أتيت الذي تُشير به علي ؟ فقال : والله لو رأيت منكراً ما وسعني إلاّ أن أنهاك عنه ، وأخبرك بالحق لله فيه ، لما أخذ الله على أهل العلم عن أن يبينوه للناس ولا يكتموه ، وما رأيت منك إلاّ خيراً . (أنساب الأشراف للبلاذري)

After the incident of Karbala, when many people of Madinah Munawwara were breaking the pledge of allegiance they had made to Yazîd, on account of what they were hearing regarding him, Abdullâh ibn Umar ﵁ not only remained firm on his pledge, but in fact severely reprimanded those who had broken theirs.

Imam Ahmed narrates in his Musnad, with a strong (saheeh) sanad[156]:

'When the people were breaking their allegiance, Abdullâh ibn Umar ﵁ gathered his sons and family members and said to them, 'We have pledged allegiance to this man, and I have heard Rasulullâh ﷺ saying, 'One who deceives shall have a flag raised for him on the Day of Judgement, which shall expose him as a deceiver.' Verily, after ascribing partners to Allâh, the greatest act of deception one could do is that he breaks his allegiance (which he has made to the Muslim leader). ***O my family, let not any one of you pull his hand away from Yazîd, nor even entertain this thought. If you do such an act, Abdullâh Ibn Umar shall cut himself off from you totally!'***

3) Ibn Kathir, in Al-Bidâyah, narrates that Abu Ja'far (Baqir) said[157],

'On the Day of Harrah (when the army of Yazîd attacked Madinah Munawwara) ***from the family of Abu Talib and from the family of Abdul Muttalib, not a single person rose to fight the army****. And when the leader of the army, Muslim ibn Uqbah arrived, he (Muslim) honoured Abu Ja'far, made him sit close to him, and handed him a document promising them safety.'*

---

[156] حدثنا عبد الله حدثني أبي ثنا إسماعيل حدثني صخر بن جويرية عن نافع قال : لما خلع الناس يزيد بن معاوية جمع بن عمر بنيه وأهله ثم تشهد ثم قال أما بعد فإنا قد بايعنا هذا الرجل على بيع الله ورسوله وإني سمعت رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم يقول إن الغادر ينصب له لواء يوم القيامة يقال هذه غدرة فلان وإن من أعظم الغدر أن لا يكون الإشراك بالله تعالى أن يبايع رجل رجلا على بيع الله ورسوله صلى الله عليه وسلم ثم ينكث بيعته فلا يخلعن أحد منكم يزيد ولا يشرفن أحد منكم في هذا الأمر فيكون صيلم بيني وبينه – مسند احمد – (تعليق شعيب الأرنؤوط : إسناده صحيح على شرط الشيخين)

[157] وقال أبو جعفر الباقر لم يخرج أحد من آل أبى طالب ولا من بنى عبد المطلب أيام الحرة ولما قدم مسلم بن عقبة المدينة أكرمه وأدنى مجلسه واعطاه كتاب أمان (البداية)

The reason that these illustrious personalities refused to take part in the uprising against Yazîd could either be that they never at all believed the accusations made against Yazîd, as Muhammad ibn Hanafiyah ﵁ clearly stated, or it could have been for the reason that the Ahâdith of Rasulullâh ﷺ strongly condemned breaking one's allegiance, merely on account of news that reaches one, portraying the Muslim leader to be evil. Ubadah ibn Saamit ﵁, discussing the pledge that they had made with Rasulullâh ﷺ, explained one of the points to be, as narrated by Imam Bukhâri in his Saheeh:

وأن لا ننازع الأمر أهله إلا أن تروا كفرا بواحا عندكم من الله فيه برهان

'*And that we do not fight against our leaders, **until and unless we find them involved in open disbelief**, for which we have substantial proof.*'

In fact, when one studies these words of Rasulullâh ﷺ, one shall realise that the Ummah were being warned that shaitaani forces shall time and again try to incite the masses in standing up against their leaders, ensuring that in-fighting continues, and government stability is never attained. The words used by Rasulullâh ﷺ, i.e. '**until and unless we find them involved in open disbelief'** this phrase makes clear indication that such propaganda shall one day be made against Muslim leaders which many shall open-heartedly believe, despite not having seen or heard the actual witness and not having verified the report. In such conditions, Rasulullâh ﷺ showed the safest route for the Ummah, that as long as open disbelief is not proven, no matter what accusations reach your ears regarding your leader, do not fall prey to the propaganda, but rather remain true to your pledge.

To better understand this point, in recent history, for the purpose of totally destroying the Muslim Caliphate (known as The Ottoman Empire), an all-out effort was made to paint an evil picture of the Sultân in the minds of the masses. So strong was the propaganda against the Sultân, that in the lands of Hijaaz, high-ranking scholars signed verdicts which showed the permissibility and in fact ordered the

Arab masses to rise up against the Turkish ruler. At that time, Sheikhul-Hind, Hadhrat Moulâna Mahmudul-Hasan Deobandi, was also in Makkah Mukarramah. Due to the high position he held, especially in the eyes of the Muslim public of Hindustan and surrounding areas, he too was ordered to sign. Sheikhul-Hind, even after being threatened with life imprisonment, flatly refused.

The Grand Mufti of Makkah Mukarramah summoned Sheikhul-Hind in an attempt to get his signature, and questioned the reason behind his refusal to sign, despite the fact that the present caliph, Sultân Abdul Hamid, had openly committed acts of kufr and fisq. The crux of Sheikhul-Hind's answer was the very point that this booklet is attempting to drive forward, i.e. as long as there is no concrete evidence of open kufr, breaking one's allegiance merely on the basis of 'widespread allegations' could never be deemed permissible. Sheikhul-Hind understood well that lending an ear to the allegations being made against the present caliph and calling for a better caliph, despite this call seeming so 'rosy', would ultimately end in disaster for the entire Muslim world.

Sheikhul-Hind would years later meet Ashraf Beig, a general from the cabinet of Sultân Abdul-Hamid, who would reveal that most of the allegations against the caliph had in fact been fabricated solely to incite the Muslim world, and especially the Arabs, against the Turkish rule. Discussing this meeting, Hadhrat Moulâna Husein Ahmed Madani quotes in Aseer-e-Malta:

Ashraf Beig was amongst the favorites of Sultan Abdul Hamid Marhoom. He had a unique talent to recognize the talents of others and from childhood he developed a concern regarding all internal and external political matters.

Many a time, when the mention of Sultan Abdul Hamid Marhoom would spring up in our discussions, he would speak out saying,

"People criticize the Sultan with regards to his piety. The truth however is that the Sultan was an extremely pious and ascetic man. His abstinence from that which has been forbidden was of a very high level. I should know better, since I had the opportunity to observe him from the closest of ranges.

I still remember him spanking me when he found me involving myself in acts of childhood mischief. The misconception regarding the Sultan arose due to evil elements that surrounded him, whose intention was nothing but to make the masses lose faith in his manner of rule. We made continuous efforts to remove these misconceptions and answer the objections and accusations that were being leveled against the Sultan, but it could never match the propaganda of the evil forces all around."

The efforts of these evil elements finally led to Ashraf Beig himself being exiled from Turkey (End of quotation from Aseer-e-Malta)

The outcome of lending an ear to the allegations being made against Sultân Abdul-Hamid, the Turkish caliph, as Hadhrat Sheikhul-Hind had feared, resulted in the Caliphate shortly thereafter being totally abolished, the Muslim world being torn into separate states, kuffaar forces now freely pouncing upon Muslim lands, knowing full well that no Muslim country shall stand up for the next, and many other disastrous consequences.

Today, when one ponders over the heart-breaking scenes that the Ummah has already seen, and continues seeing, due to the Arab rebellion against the Ottoman Empire, one gets some glimpse of the foresight that Almighty Allâh had blessed Sheikhul-Hind with, regarding world politics and shaitaani traps, and of the deep understanding he had of the Quraan and Sunnah, but alas, at that time none were willing to accept his words!

From the brief history of how Sheikhul-Hind viewed the Arabs decision to revolt against the Ottoman Empire, due to the many allegations against its leader that had reached their ears, and the outcome of the rebellion, much can be understood regarding how shaitaani forces operate, how they incite the masses against their own leaders, and how they ensure that Muslim government stability is never attained.

Continuing with the accusations made against Yazîd, if one were merely to ponder over these accusations, one shall realise that those around Yazîd, i.e. the illustrious Sahâbah and Tâbi'een of Shâm, had never spoken out against Yazîd. After having just come out of the period where the chair of the Caliphate had been occupied by the Sahâbah, after having seen such pious personalities rule from their courts with justice and piety, can one ever imagine that in Yazîd's short period of rule, he (Yazîd) could immediately stand up with the courage and audacity to commit such filthy acts, as has been ascribed to him, in full view of those around, yet not a single Sahâbi, nor Tabi'ee of Shâm finds the courage to speak out against his wrongs!

Could one ever entertain the possibility that all the great jurists, judges, mufassireen, mujaahideen of that era, of the blessed lands of Shâm, and particularly, the area of Damascus, were guilty of the crime of abandoning their duty of 'inviting to good and prohibiting from evil' and none had that Imaani fervour to speak the truth in front of an 'oppressive' ruler? Understand well, that when one accepts the accusations levelled against Yazîd ibn Muawiyah, one is in fact also accepting an accusation which has been made against the rest of the Ummah of that era, since they showed their happiness with the Ummayyad Dynasty.

Eight points worth pondering over

Together with the above, ponder slightly over the following eight points:

1. Ali ibn Husein (Zainul-Aabideen)ﷺ, the son of Hadhrat Huseinﷺ, spent over a month by Yazîd, just after the incident of Karbala, during which time, as narrations mention, Yazîd would not eat a meal except that he was present, yet not a single narration has come from the lips of Zainul-Aabideen in which mention is made that Yazîd would drink liquor, or commit filthy acts in his court. Had Yazîd been perpetrating these acts so openly, at least once he would have seen something, and the demand of his Imaan would surely have made him speak out, if not in front of Yazîd, then at least in front of others.

2. Hadhrat Abdullâh ibn Ja'far and Hadhrat Nu'maan ibn Basheer were amongst those who enjoyed a very close and strong relationship with Yazîd. Hadhrat Nu'maan ibn Basheer served as Yazîd's governor over Kufa, and thereafter was appointed as Yazîd's senior advisor in Shâm itself, in the matters of the state.

As for Hadhrat Abdullâh ibn Ja'far, that noble Sahâbi, regarding whom Rasulullâhﷺ said, 'Abdullâh resembles me in appearance and in character', mention had already been made in the above passages, that Hadhrat Abdullâh ibn Ja'far, after coming to Yazîd, remained with him until the incident of Harrah (the attack made by Yazîd's army against the people of Medina Munawwara).

Despite the closeness that these two illustrious men enjoyed with Yazîd, we find no record of any of them ever criticizing or even mentioning with regards to Yazîd drinking liquor, abandoning Salaah, etc. How could it be that those who were far had witnessed these affairs, whereas those close by remained totally unaware of it?

3. Qadhi Abu Bakr ibn Al-Arabi has mentioned the following in Al-Awaasim[158]:

'If one were to say that Yazîd was addicted to the bottle, we shall say, 'This accusation shall not be heard and considered as long as two witnesses are not presented, so who are your witnesses?

4. In the footnotes of Al-Awaasim, under the above quotation, written by Muhibbudeen Al-Katheeb and Mahmood Mahdi Al-Istanbuli, the following has been mentioned[159]:

---

158 قال القاضي أبو بكر بن العربي: "فإن قيل: كان يزيد خماراً. قلنا: لا يحل إلا بشاهدين، فمن شهد بذلك عليه؟ (العواصم من القواصم)

159 إن الذين نسبوا ليزيد ما لا يحل هم – الرافضة للتوصل إلى التشكيك بالقرآن من وراء الطعن بمعاوية ومن عم الخلفاء الذن ولوه وأقروه على الحكم، وهم نقلة القرآن وحفظته.

* لقد كان يزيد غائبا عن الشام حينما مات أبوه فلما وصل دمشق جددت له البيعة، ثم جمع الناس في الجامع وخطب فيهم مما يدل على تقواه قائلا بعد حمد الله والثناء عليه:

أيها الناس! إن معاوية كان عبدا من عبدي الله، أنعم الله عليه، ثم قبضه إليه، وهو خير من بعده ودون من قبله!. ولا أزكيه على الله عز وجل، فإنه أعلم به. إن عفا عنه فبرحمته، وإن عاقبه فبذنبه. وقد وليت الأمر من بعده، وليست آسى على طلب، ولا أعتذر من تفريط، وإذا أراد الله شيئا كان. إن معاوية كان يغزيكم البحر، وإني لست حاملا أحدا من المسلمين لعل مراده إلا بإذنه واختياره بدليل العبارة التي بعدها في البحر وأن معاوية كان يشتيكم بأرض الروم، ولست مشتيا أحدا بأرض الروم. وإن معاوية كان يخرج لكم العطاء أثلاثا. وأنا أجمعه لكم كله. قال الراوي فافترق الناس عنه وهم لا يفضلون عليه أحدا. (البداية)

ومن خطب يزيد الدالة على حصافة عقله وحسن بصيرته وتقواه: الحمدُ للّه أحمده وأستعينه وأومن به وأتوكّل عليه ونَعوذ باللّه من شرور أنفسنا ومن سيّات أعمالنا مَن يَهْد اللّه فلا مُضِلَّ له ومن يُضْلِل فلا هاديَ له وأشهد أن لا إله إلا اللّه وحدَه لا شريك له وأن محمداً عبدُه ورسولُه اصطفاه لوَحْيه . واختاره لرسالته بكتاب فصَّله وفَضّله وأعزَّه وأكرَمه ونَصره وحَفِظه ضرَب فيه الأمثال وحلّل فيه الحلال وحرَّم فيه الحرام وشَرَع فيه الدِّين إعذاراً وإنذاراً لئلا يكونَ للناس على اللّه حُجَّة بعد الرُّسل ويكونَ بلاغاً لقوم عابدين . أوصيكم عبادَ اللّه بتقوى اللّه العظيم الذي ابتدأ الأمور بعِلْمه وإليه يَصير مَعادُها وانقطاع مُدّتها وتَصرُّم دارها .

ثم إني أحَذِّركم الدُنْيا فإنها حُلْوَة خَضِرَة حُفّت بالشَّهوات ورَاقتْ بالقليل وأينعت بالفاني وتحبَّبت بالعاجل لا يَدومُ نَعيمُها ولا يؤْمَن فجيعُها أكّالة غَوَّالة غرَّارة لا تُبْقي على حال ولا يَبقى لها حال ولن تَعْدُو الدنيا إذا تناهت إلى أمْنية أهل الرغبة فيها والرِّضا بها أن تكون كما قال اللّه عزَّ وجلَّ : " واضْرب لهم مَثَل الحَيَاة الدُّنيا كماءٍ أنْزَلناه من السماِء " إلى قوله ومُقْتَدِراً نسأل اللّه ربَّنا وإلهنا وخالِقنا ومولانا أنْ يجعلنا وإياكم من فزَع يومئذ آمنين . إنَّ أحسَن الحديثِ وأبلغَ الموعظة كتابُ اللّه يقول اللّه : ما له " وإذا قُرِئ القُرآن فاسْتَمِعُوا لهُ وأنْصِتُوا لعلكم ترحَمُون " . أعوذ باللّه من الشيطان الرجيم بسم اللّه الرحمن الرحيم لَقَدْ جَاءَكم رَسُولٌ من أنْفِسِكم إلى آخرً السورة . (العقد الفريد – ابن عبد ربه الأندلسي)

('The fact of the matter is that the Rawaafid (sect of the shia) had attributed many lies to Yazîd, attempting thereby to create doubt in the authenticity of the Quraan, by thereafter implicating Hadhrat Muawiyah as the guilty one, since he had instated Yazîd as caliph, and after Hadhrat Muawiyah, to implicate the Khulefa-e-Raashideen, since they had instated Hadhrat Muawiyah as governor during their rule. After implicating all these illustrious men in the so called 'crimes' of Yazîd, the question would then be posed that when these men were in the forefront of preserving the Noble Quraan, how can the Quraan ever be accepted as authentic? Nauuzubillah!

When Hadhrat Muawiyah passed away, Yazîd was absent. When he returned to Damascus, a fresh allegiance was pledged at his hands. He thereafter gathered the people and delivered a sermon, which greatly indicates towards his fear of Almighty Allâh. He said, after praising Allâh and sending salutations upon Rasulullâh,

'O People, Muawiyah was a servant of Almighty Allâh, whom Almighty Allâh had greatly favoured and Almighty Allâh has now called him back. He (Muâwiyah) was greater than those after him, but lower in rank to those that have passed before him. I shall not extol his virtues in front of Almighty Allâh, for verily Almighty Allâh knows best regarding him. If Almighty Allâh pardons him, it is solely through His mercy, and if Almighty Allâh chooses to punish him, then it shall be due to what he had committed.

Now that I have been made in charge of your matters you shall neither find me too hard in attaining what I desire, nor offering excuses when I err. And only that occurs what Almighty Allâh wishes! Verily Muawiyah had ordered that you go out for Jihaad on the sea. As for me, I shall not force anyone to go out onto the sea. Muawiyah would ensure that you go out to the Roman lands during the cold, winter season. As for me, I shall not force anyone to go into Roman lands during the winter season. Muawiyah would grant you stipends, which

would be spread out in three portions over a year. As for me, I shall grant you your entire yearly stipend all at once.
The narrator says that after the sermon the people departed, regarding none better suited for the job than him. (Al-Bidâyah)

From amongst the sermons of Yazîd that indicate towards his intelligence, farsightedness and piety, is the following, as quoted from Iqdul-Fareed:

'All praise belongs solely to Almighty Allâh. I praise Him and seek His help. I trust upon Him and seek His protection against the evil within me, and from the evil of my deeds. Whosoever Allâh guides, none can lead astray, and whosoever Allâh misguides, none can bring him unto the straight path. I bear witness that there is none worthy of worship but Allâh alone, and I bear witness that Muhammadﷺ is the servant and messenger of Allâh, who Allâh had selected and chosen to receive the revelation of a Book, which Allâh had sent down bit by bit, which Allâh had honoured over all else, which Allâh had himself protected. In it, Almighty Allâh has explained all important matters through beautiful parables, has defined what is permissible and what is not, and has issued severe warnings for disobedience and not heeding to His جل جلاله call. All this has been done so that man can now never say he was not properly informed.

O Allâh's servants, I advise you with the fear of Allâh, who is The Most Great, who initiated all affairs and to whom, when its time is up, shall all affairs once again return.
I warn you of the harms of this world, for verily it seems sweet and lush, but in fact gives only little and its fruits are indeed temporary. Its pleasures are not eternal, and it can never be trusted. It is nothing but a destroyer of one's deeds and a deceiver!
When it finally does come to those who are greedy for it, it only remains by him for a short while, as Almighty Allâh has describes in Surah Kahf with the verse:

واضْرب لهم مَثَل الحَيَاة الدُّنيا كماءٍ أنْزَلناه من السمِاء

We implore Almighty Allâh, who is our Sustainer, Lord, Creator, and Master, that He grants us protection from the horrors of the Day of Judgement.
Verily, the greatest and most unique advice is that of the Quraan. Almighty Allâh commands:
'When the Quraan is recited, listen attentively. Perhaps you shall become the recipient of divine mercy.'

Yazîd thereafter ended his sermon by reciting, the last verse of Surah Taubah:

(End of quotation from the footnotes of Al-Awaasim)

5. Hadhrat Ali ibn Abi Talibﷺ displayed his love for the three Khulefaﷺ that preceded himﷺ by naming his sons after them. The sons that were born after Hadhrat Hasanﷺ, Hadhrat Huseinﷺ, and Hadhrat Muhammad ibn Hanafiyahﷺ, were named Abu Bakr, Umar and Uthmaan. Also he got his daughter Umme-Kulthoom married to Hadhrat Umarﷺ.
   In a similar manner Hadhrat Abdullâh ibn Ja'farﷺ (the nephew of Hadhrat Aliﷺ, and the son of Hadhrat Ja'far At-Tayyaarﷺ) also displayed his love for the Khulefahﷺ by naming one of his sons 'Abu Bakr' and another 'Muawiyah'.
   This Muawiyah, i.e. the grand nephew of Hadhrat Aliﷺ, thereafter named one of his sons 'Yazîd'. Had he regarded the caliph, Yazîd ibn Muawiyah, to be evil, he would never have tolerated that his son now become known amongst all as 'Yazîd ibn Muawiyah! (Quoting from الشيعة هم العدو فاحذروهم)
6. Ibn Aasim has narrated the following through a sound sanad[160]:

[160] وقد سأل معاوية رضي الله عنه ولد يزيد يوماً حينما أنس منه الحرص على العدل وتأسياً بالخلفاء الراشدين ، فقد كان يسأله عن الكيفية التي سيسير بها في الأمة بعد توليه الخلافة ، فيرد عليه يزيد بقوله : (كنت والله يا أبةِ عاملاً فيهم عمل عمر بن الخطاب) . ابن عاصم في الآحاد والمثاني بسند حسن

Hadhrat Muâwiyahﷺ once asked his son, Yazîd, after noticing within him an ardent love to be just and to emulate the Khulefah-e-Raashideen, as to how would he rule and conduct himself with the Ummah when he would be made caliph. Yazîd replied,

'O my beloved father, by Allâh, I will deal with them how Umar ibn Khattaab would deal with them!'

7. Ibn Kathir has recorded the statement of Abdur Rahmaan ibn Abi Mad'uur[161] regarding Yazîd. He said:
   Some of the men of knowledge had informed me that the last words of Yazîd ibn Muawiyah before his death were:

   'O Allâh! Do not take me to task for that which I never intended, nor was I ever happy with.
   O Allâh, decide between me and Ubeidullah ibn Ziyaad!'

   Abdur Rahmaan has also narrated that the writing on the ring of Yazîd was:

   (آمنت بالله العظيم)

   'I believe in Allâh, The Supreme Authority.

8. Muhibbudeen Khateeb, after having made thorough research into the life of Yazîd and the allegations levelled against him, has summarised his understanding of Yazîd in the footnotes of Awaasim. His words are indeed worthy of at least a few minutes of sincere pondering. He writes[162]:

---

[161] وقال عبد الرحمن بن أبى مدعور حدثنى بعض أهل العلم قال آخر ما تكلم به يزيد بن معاوية اللهم لا تؤاخذنى بما لم أحبه ولم أرده واحكم بينى وبين عبيد الله بن زياد وكان نقش خاتمه آمنت بالله العظيم (البناية)

[162] إن كان مقياس الأهلية لذلك أن يبلغ مبلغ أبي بكر و عمر في مجموع سجاياهما ، فهذا ما لم يبلغه في تاريخ الإسلام ، ولا عمر بن عبد العزيز ، و إن طمعنا بالمستحيل و قدرنا إمكان ظهور أبي بكر آخر و عمر آخر ، فلن تتاح له بيئة كالبيئة التي أتاحها الله لأبي بكر و عمر ، وإن كان مقياس الأهلية ، الاستقامة في السيرة ، والقيام بحرمة الشريعة ، والعمل بأحكامها ، و العدل في الناس ، و النظر في مصالحهم ، والجهاد في عدوهم ، و توسيع الآفاق لدعوتهم ، والرفق بأفرادهم و جماعاتهم ، فإن يزيد يوم

If the barometer for Yazîd being worthy of the Caliphate was that he reach the levels of Hadhrat Abu Bakr ﷺ and Hadhrat Umar ﷺ in all their traits and manners of governing, then this is something that, in the history of Islâm, none has ever reached, not even Hadhrat Umar ibn Abdul Aziz ﷺ. And if the barometer is that one's character be stable; that one be firm on the Shariah; just; concerned with the affairs of the masses; desirous that Jihaad continues and that Islâmic borders continue expanding, and that one be gentle and kind with all, irrespective whether the one in front is a lone individual or a party, ***if this is the barometer for being worthy of Caliphate, then after having made a through research into the life of Yazîd and viewing him from an extremely close angle, one shall surely agree that Yazîd was not less superior than many that appeared later, whom history continues lauding and praising till today.***

Summary:

This then is the other picture of Yazîd ibn Muawiyah, one that perhaps many had never dreamed of before. The purpose behind providing these details is not in any way meant to classify Yazîd as an angel, for Almighty Allâh alone knows the condition of the heart. Rather the intention is merely to show that Yazîd's personal life had nothing to do with the issue of Karbala, and that the accusations made famous after the battle by shaitaani forces, in an attempt to make the Ummah oblivious of the reality of Hadhrat Husein ﷺ's going over to Iraq, have hardly any substance which would be acceptable in any court. Now that one has understood the reality behind these accusations, it would indeed be an act of immaturity if one were to remain adamant that Yazîd is still and shall always be guilty, no matter what.

تُمحّص أخباره ، و يقف الناس على حقيقة حاله كما كان في حياته ، يتبين من ذلك أنه لم يكن دون كثيرين ممن تغنى التاريخ بمحامدهم ، و أجزل الثناء عليهم .

Yes, if one were to now jump to the other extreme, and start singing the praises of Yazîd, such a person should indeed be flogged, since not only is his expression of happiness over the fateful events of that era a sign of hypocrisy, but in fact a match with which the flames of infighting are rekindled.

It is for this reason, in my understanding, that when a man spoke highly of Yazîd in front of Hadhrat Umar ibn Abdul Aziz, and boldly referred to him (Yazîd) as Ameerul-Mumineen (leader of the faithful), despite his already having passed away, Umar ibn Abdul Aziz, understanding that such sentences could suddenly reignite the flames of internal war that had just been extinguished, ordered that the man be given twenty lashes.[163]

The after-math of Karbala and the Battle of Harrah

Justice to the incident of Karbala can only be done if one looks at it from ten years before the incident and ten years after. This rule in fact applies to all political events. If one studies an event only by looking at the few days during which it occurred, in all probability, one shall accuse a party that has been framed. To find the truth, one needs to search in the past, to see which parties were deeply active in preparing the scene for what has just occurred, and then one has to patiently wait until the future shows which party benefitted the most from what had occurred. In the incident of Hadhrat Husein رضي الله عنه and Yazîd, the past and the future clearly indicate towards the existence of evil forces operating from Iraq, manipulating scenes and instigating one group of sincere men against another.

When the battle of Karbala ended, many felt that this sad episode in history had now terminated, whereas in reality it was only beginning.

---

[163] وروى محمد بن أبي السري العسقلاني، حدثنا يحيى بن عبدالملك ابن أبي غنية، عن نوفل بن أبي الفرات، قال: كنت عند عمر بن عبد العزيز فقال رجل: قال أمير المؤمنين يزيد، فأمر به فضرب عشرين سوطا (سير اعلام النبلاء)

The blood of Hadhrat Husein ﷺ was taken, so that it could be used as bait to be dangled in front of the Muslim world, forcing them to once again draw the swords of infighting, which Hadhrat Muawiyah ﷺ had just managed to have sheath.

Before the incident of Karbala, the majority of the inhabitants of Makkah Mukarramah and Madinah Munawwara had accepted Yazîd as their ruler, thus very few joined Hadhrat Husein ﷺ when he ﷺ left for Iraq. The attitude of the people of Hijaaz however changed after hearing exaggerated stories of what had transpired on the plains of Karbala, from shaitaani hypocrites who were streaming in from all sides, each with a story more dreadful than the one that preceded it.

Just as the shaitaani forces had desired, the fire of infighting had now been rekindled, and talks of rebelling against the caliph could be heard from all corners. When Yazîd received the news, in accordance to what any leader would do, he too ordered that an army be sent out immediately to suppress the rebellion.

In the battles that occurred thereafter, many illustrious figures lost their lives, and shaitaani forces, after having painted the scenes of these battles in the ugliest of ways, could now spread out into the Muslim lands fully armed with the propaganda required to make the Muslim world rebel against the Ummayyad Caliphate. After the painted images of Yazîd's cruelty at Karbala, followed by the massacres he had caused in Makkah Mukarramah and Madinah Munawwara, there was now no way anyone could stand in support of Yazîd. The time was now ripe for shaitaani forces to cry for revenge and go out in full force to tear the caliphate to the ground.

To spearhead this shaitaani movement, the devil that Rasulullâh ﷺ had labelled as the **dajjâl of Thaqeef**, i.e. Mukhtaar ibn Abu Ubeid Thaqafi, was now ready to rise. However, before proceeding with Mukhtaar's rise against the caliphate, it would indeed seem appropriate to shed a bit of light on the battles that occurred in Makkah Mukarramah and

Madinah Munawwara, between the army of Yazîd and the inhabitants of these two Holy Lands.

When the details of these battles are read from a surface level, one can easily be forgiven if he starts hating Yazîd and his entire army, since the love of Madinah Munawwara and its inhabitants is a trait which has been ingrained within the heart of every believer, as is the case with the love of Hadhrat Husein ﷺ. However, when deeper investigation is done, a picture starts to emerge, quite different from what has over the years been understood.

In describing the battle that occurred against the inhabitants of Medina Munawwara, famously known as 'the battle of Harrah', shaitaani elements went one step further in adding spice to what was already a hot curry, with some taking the bold step to spoil the pages of history with such filthy lies, the likes of which perhaps no other leader or army has ever been accused of.

Examples of such lies, which spilled from the filthy tongues of shaitaani hypocrites, which would later innocently be narrated in the compilations of historians, are the following:

a) During the battle over one thousand virgins were raped at the hands of the oppressive soldiers that had come from Shâm.[164] Nauuzubillah!

b) As a result of being raped, one thousand women of Madinah Munawwara gave birth.[165] Nauuzubillah!

[164] ورد في دلائل النبوة للبيهقي من طريق يعقوب بن سفيان قال: حدثنا يوسف بن موسى حدثنا جرير بن المغيرة قال: أنهب مسرف بن عقبة المدينة ثلاثة أيام، فزعم المغيرة أنه افتض فيها ألف عذراء

[165] أول من أشار إلى انتهاك الأعراض، المدائني المتوفي سنة **225**هـ حيث قال المدائني عن أبي قرة عن هشام بن حسان قال: وَلَدت بعد الحرة ألف امرأة من غير زوج

c) A soldier from Shâm entered the home of an Ansaari woman, who was breastfeeding her child. He threatened her that if she did not hand over her gold, he would kill her and her child. The woman scream out, ‘How dare you kill this boy, whose father is Abu Kabasha, the companion of Rasulullâhﷺ, and I am from the women who had pledged allegiance to Rasulullâhﷺ!’ The soldier, taking no notice of her words, grabbed the child whose mouth was still on the woman’s breast, and bashed him upon a nearby wall, smashing his brains. In frustration, the woman cried and said, ‘O my child, had I anything which I could give to save you, I would surely have given it!’ As the soldier left the room, half his face turned black and he had to walk amongst the people disfigured. Nauuzubillah![166]

d) A virgin was raped right in front of Rasulullâhﷺs sacred chamber, and after raping the girl, when the soldier could not find anything with which to wipe away the blood that was on him, he took a page of the Noble Quraan and used it to wipe himself clean! Nauuzubillah![167]

This, i.e. (d) is perhaps **the most filthy and despicable lie** that has found its way into the books of history, but the narrations mentioned before it, i.e. (a), (b) and (c) are not any much better. Besides these, there are many more such narrations, not only with regards to Yazîd, but rather, even with regards to the illustrious Khulefa-e-Raashideenرضي الله عنهم, the wives of Rasulullâhﷺ, the Sahâbahرضي الله عنهم in general, and many of the great personalities that came after. When shaitaani agents target any individual, they spare no effort in painting him with the worst propaganda one could ever dream of, and they do it in such a manner that the one who refutes it is regarded as the biggest liar.

---

[166] سمط النجوم

[167] وافتض فيها ألف عذراء، وإن مفتضَّها فعل ذلك أمام الوجه الشريف، والتمس ما يمسح به الدم، فلم يجد، ففتح مصحفاً قريباً منه، ثم أخذ من أوراقه ورقة، فتمسح بها (سمط النجوم)

If every narration of history gets afforded the status of ‘accepted without question’, merely due to it appearing in a book, comprising of a couple of volumes, or having a fancy title and some beautiful binding, then perhaps not a single saint’s sainthood shall remain in Islâmic history, since surrounding every great man would always be great enemies, whose tongues and limbs would tire themselves out in their attempt to defame and disgrace them, and what their hearts would conceal, that would be even worse.

In the blatant lies mentioned above, i.e. (a), (b), (c) and (d), the lineage of over a thousand Tab-e’-Tâbi’een has been tainted, yet amazingly no mention can be found in the books regarding the great men that were born in Madinah Munawwara, that so and so individual was born as a result of his mother being raped by a Shaami soldier!

To understand the reality of these narrations, one needs only to ponder over the fact that despite rape being the most hideous of crimes in Islâm, especially if it has to occur in the most sacred of cities, with the most purest of women, affecting over a thousand families, yet no mention of it can be found in any of the books of Sunnah, through even one solid chain, Saheeh, Hasan nor even what is known as Dhaeef. Besides the books of Sunnah, even the first books written on Islâmic history, viz. the Târikh of Tabari and Balaazari, whose authors narrated greatly from Abu Mikhnaf, the infamous shia liar, in these books too no mention can be found of any woman of Madinah Munawwara being raped during these battles.[168]

---

[168] ذكرت إنتهاب المدينة وأثبتناها في موضعها، لم يرد فيها ذكر لانتهاك الأعراض . إن انتهاك أعراض نساء المدينة لا أساس لها من الصحة، وأنها روايات جاءت متأخرة، وبدافع التي تمثل الجيش الأموي جيشاً بربرياً لا يستند لأسس دينية أو عقائدية أو أخلاقية، وهذا الاتهام لا يقصد به اتهام الجيش الأموي فقط، بل إنَّ الخطورة التي يحملها هذا الاتهام تتعدى إلى ما هو أعظم من مجرد اتهام الجيش الأموي، إلى اتهام الجيش الإسلامي الذي فتح أصقاعاً شاسعة في تلك الفترة ... و لم نجد في كتب السنة أو في تلك الكتب التي ألفت في الفتن وكذلك لم نجد في المصدرين التاريخيين المهمين عن هذه الفترة وهما (الطبري والبلاذري) أي إشارة لوقوع شيء من ذلك، وهما قد اعتمد على روايات الإخبار بين المشهورين مثل عوانة بن الحكم وأبي مخنف الشيعي

Any reader of Islâmic history who finds such narrations acceptable, should understand well that the accusations levelled are not only being directed towards the Ummayyad army that served under Yazîd, but rather towards the Islâmic armies of Shâm, which Rasulullâhﷺ had praised, the very armies that carried the flags of Islâm through many lands, holding firmly upon the principles of piety, justice and mercy that Islâm has always taught, yet in these narrations those very armies have been depicted as barbarians, void of all morals and basic human character. (If the filth of shaitaani propaganda cannot be smelt in even these narrations, then to Allâh alone do we complain of our plight!)

Another major lie that becomes apparent when one studies the incident of 'the battle of Harrah' is with regards to the number of Sahâbah martyred during this battle. Many books of history show that between three to seven hundred Sahâbah were martyred during this battle, whereas when one searches for narrations with strong chains, one fails to find mention of even ten Sahâbah losing their lives during this battle.

Hafiz Zahabi has recorded in Al-I'bar that during the battle of Harrah three hundred and six of the children of the Muhaajireen and Ansaar were martyred and from the Sahâbah, Hadhrat Ma'qil ibn Sinaan, Hadhrat Abdullâh ibn Hanzalah and Hadhrat Abdullâh ibn Zaid ibn Aa'sim were martyred.[169]

وغيرهما ، ويعتبر ابن الجوزي هو أول من أورد هذا الخبر في تاريخه ، وفي رسالته الخاصة التي ألفها في الطعن على يزيد بن معاوية وإظهار مثالبه ، وقد نقلها عن ابن الجوزي السمهودي مؤرخ المدينة المتوفي في القرن العاشر الهجري ، ويبدو أن الطبري، والبلاذري وخليفة بن خياط وغيرهم، لم يقتنعوا بصحة هذا الخبر ، فإنهم قد أعرضوا عنه ولم يدخلوه في كتبهم ولا يوجد خبر صحيح الإسناد في حادثة الاغتصاب المزعومة ، ومن الجدير بالذكر أن كل من أورد خبر انتهاك أعراض أهل المدينة في معركة الحرَّة قد اعتمد على رواية يعقوب أو رواية المدائني فقط، وكلاهما لا تصح ولا تثبت ، وقد أطلق العنان بعض الكتّاب لرغباتهم وأهوائهم ولم يستندوا إلى إي دليل والروايات المتعلقة بالاغتصاب لا يمكن الاعتماد عليها، ثم إن القرائن المصاحبة لمعركة الحرّة تنفي وجود أي نوع من الاغتصاب (الدولة الاموية –مع بعض التغيير – محمد الصلابي)

[169] فقتل من أولاد المهاجرين والأنصار ثلاث مئة وست أنفس. وقتل من الصحابة: معقل بن سنان الأشجعي، وعبد الله بن حنظلة الغسيل الأنصاري، وعبد الله بن زيد بن عاصم المازني (العبر–الذهبي)

According to a narration, quoted in Al-Bidâyah, which can be traced through a strong chain to Imam Malik, the amount of men of the Quraan that were martyred during the battle of Harrah were about seven hundred. After narrating this portion, Ibn Wahab, the famous student of Imam Malik says, 'If I am correct, Imam Malik also said, 'Amongst the martyrs, three of four were from the Sahâbah.'

Even though Ibn Wahab narrated this portion with the words, 'If I am correct', then too the very fact that he thought that Imam Malik had said this, that shows that during his era, which was not very long after these wars, the people of Medina Munawwara knew nothing of the narrations which made mention that during the battle of Harrah between three hundred to seven hundred Sahâbah were martyred. If such a large number of Sahâbah had really been martyred on that fateful day, it would have been common knowledge amongst the people of Medina Munawwara, and Ibn Wahab would never have made such an error.

The writings of Imam Abu Ja'far Tahaawi, the great jurist of the Hanafi Mazhab, also indicates that the number of Sahâbah who were martyred during this battle were few. While discussing a chain of narrators, Imam Tahawi wrote the following:

'The Ashja'i, from whom Sha'bi has narrated is none other than Hadhrat Ma'qil ibn Sinaan, that Sahâbi whose death occurred quite later than the other companions of Rasulullâh. He, in fact, only passed away during the day of Harrah. He was ***one of those Sahâbah martyred*** *during that battle.'*

By Imam Tahawi saying 'he was one of those Sahâbah martyred during that battle', instead of 'he was one from the **many** Sahâbah that passed away during that battle', there is clear indication that only a few Sahâbah had passed away on this occasion.

From what has been mentioned above, one can clearly understand that, as with Karbala, the incident of Harrah has also been filled with countless lies, merely so that the image of the ruling party could be tarnished in the eyes of the public, enabling shaitaani forces to gather support for their well-planned future attack on the Muslim caliphate.

As was the case of Karbala, the picture that history generally painted of the battle of Harrah fails to answer many questions, which has conveniently thereafter been swept under the carpet. Amongst those questions are the following:

a) Had the soldiers of Yazîd really been raping the women of Madinah Munawwara, as the books describe, why then did Abdullâh ibn Umarﷺ, and the other senior Sahâbahﷺ not speak out against these oppressive and filthy demonic acts? Rather, what has been clearly proven is that not only did these senior Sahâbahﷺ refrain from speaking out, they in fact ordered their families to remain obedient to the caliph, and not break their allegiance. This point has been proven from many authentic sources, a few of which are:

- Imam Ahmed narrates in his Musnad, with a strong (saheeh) sanad[170]:

  'When the people were breaking their allegiance, Abdullâh ibn Umarﷺ gathered his sons and family members and said to them, 'We have pledged allegiance to this man, and I have heard Rasulullâhﷺ saying, 'One who deceives shall have a flag raised for him on the Day of Judgement, which

---

[170] حدثنا عبد الله حدثني أبي ثنا إسماعيل حدثني صخر بن جويرية عن نافع قال : لما خلع الناس يزيد بن معاوية جمع بن عمر بنيه وأهله ثم تشهد ثم قال أما بعد فإنا قد بايعنا هذا الرجل على بيع الله ورسوله وإني سمعت رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم يقول إن الغادر ينصب له لواء يوم القيامة يقال هذه غدرة فلان وإن من أعظم الغدر أن لا يكون الإشراك بالله تعالى أن يبايع رجل رجلا على بيع الله ورسوله صلى الله عليه وسلم ثم ينكث بيعته فلا يخلعن أحد منكم يزيد ولا يشرفن أحد منكم في هذا الأمر فيكون صيلم بيني وبينه – مسند احمد – (تعليق شعيب الأرنؤوط : إسناده صحيح على شرط الشيخين)

shall expose him as a deceiver.' Verily, after ascribing partners to Allâh, the greatest act of deception one could do is that he breaks his allegiance (which he has made to the Muslim leader). ***O my family, let not any one of you pull his hand away from Yazîd, nor even entertain this thought. If you do such an act, Abdullâh Ibn Umar shall cut himself off from you totally!****'*

- Ibn Kathir, in Al-Bidâyah, narrates that Abu Ja'far (Baqir) said[171], *'On the Day of Harrah (when the army of Yazîd attacked Madinah Munawwara)* ***from the family of Abu Talib and from the family of Abdul Muttalib, not a single person rose to fight the army****. And when the leader of the army, Muslim ibn Uqbah arrived, he (Muslim) honoured Abu Ja'far, made him sit close to him, and handed him a document promising them safety.'*

b) Had Yazîd really ordered that his soldiers plunder and raid Madinah Munawwara, and rape its noble women, would the people of Shâm have remained sitting back quietly, without raising a single objection. At least his close advisors would have been aware of the filthy orders he had issued, and at least one of them would have raised an objection. Rather, history itself records that when the news of what had occurred during the battle at Madinah Munawwara, reached the ears of Yazîd, he expressed shock and grief, and immediately set out to try and make amends for the losses the people of Madinah Munawwara had suffered, due to the war.

Madaaini narrates:

'Muslim ibn Uqbah sent Raoh ibn Zanbaa' to Yazîd, to give him the glad-tidings of the victory at Harrah. When Yazîd heard the details of the battle, the words that emitted from his lips were, ***'Alas, how sad is the plight of my people!'*** *He thereafter called Dhahhaak ibn*

---

[171] وقال أبو جعفر الباقر لم يخرج أحد من آل أبى طالب ولا من بنى عبد المطلب أيام الحرة ولما قدم مسلم بن عقبة المدينة أكرمه وأدنى مجلسه واعطاه كتاب أمان (البداية)

Qaisﷺ and asked him what could be done to ease the plight of the people of Madinah Munawwara. Dhahhaak replied, 'Food and generous handouts.' ***Yazîd immediately complied and had food, money and all other kind of necessary aid delivered to Madinah Munawwara****.*

After narrating this, Allâmah ibn Kathir comments:

'This is quite contrary to what the lying Rawaafidh (sect of the shia) narrate!'[172]

c) When Yazîd dispatched his army to Madinah Munawwara and Makkah Mukarramah, the general appointed over the Palestinian garrison was Rauh ibn Zan'baa', and it was this very person who was sent to inform Yazîd of the victory of his army. According to what authentic sources have quoted, Raoh ibn Zan'baa' was an ardent worshipper of Almighty Allâh, a true Islâmic warrior, from the Sayyids of Shâm. He narrated from Hadhrat Tamim Daariﷺ and the people of Shâm would narrate Ahâdith from him.[173] Abdul Malik ibn Marwân described Roah as follows, "Roah has encompassed the worship of the people of Shâm, the cunningness of the people of Iraq and the fiqh of the people of Hijaaz.[174]

As for the Damascan garrison, the general appointed over them was in fact a Sahâbiﷺ of Rasulullâhﷺ, Hadhrat Abdullâh ibn Mas'adaﷺ, one

---

172 وروى المدائنى أن مسلم بن عقبة بعث روح بن زنباع إلى يزيد ببشارة الحرة فلما أخبره بما وقع قال واقوماه ثم دعا الضحاك بن قيس الفهرى فقال له ترى ما لقى أهل المدينة فما الذى يجبرهم قال الطعام والأعطية فأمر بحمل الطعام إليهم وأفاض عليهم أعطيته وهذا خلاف ما ذكره كذبة الروافض (البداية)

173 روح بن زنباع الجذامي من أهل فلسطين وكان عابدا غازيا من سادات أهل الشام يروى عن تميم الداري روى عنه أهل الشام (الثقات لابن حبان)

174 قال عبد الملك جمع روح طاعة أهل الشام ودهاء أهل العراق وفقه أهل الحجاز (اسد الغابة)

who had enjoyed the privilege of being reared in the lap of Hadhrat Fatimahؓ.[175]

If such men were appointed as the leaders of different garrisons when the army of Yazîd advanced towards Madinah Munawwara, could it ever be conceived that they would just stand by watching as the so-called 'bloodthirsty' soldiers of Yazîd's army raped noble women and killed innocent children around them!?

d) In Akhbaarul-Qudaat, it had been mentioned that despite being defeated by the army of Yazîd, a few weeks later, upon receiving the news of the death of Yazîd, the people of Madinah Munawwara again stood up against the ruling party, and this time achieved success. The governor and leaders from Shâm were exiled and Ubeidah ibn Zubeir, the brother of Abdullâh ibn Zubeirؓ was brought in as their new governor.[176]

Had Yazîd's army really caused the massacre, which certain paragraphs of history describe, would the people of Madinah Munawwara ever have been able to recoup so quickly and stage a successful attack within just a few days of their initial defeat?!

The above are just some of the points that clearly indicate that, as with the issue of Karbala, here too a lot of exaggeration and lies have surrounded this episode, thus rendering one incapable of properly understanding what had really occurred during the unfortunate episode of Harrah. As with Karbala, which had turned the hearts of the people of Hijaaz against the Ummayyads, the battle of Harrah would now be used to turn the hearts of the rest of the Muslim empire

---

175 عبد الله بن مسعدة بن مسعود الفزاري وهو من صغار الصحابة ذكره البغوي وغيره في الصحابة كان عبد الله في سبي بني فزارة فوهبه النبي صلى الله عليه وسلم لابنته فاطمة فأعتقته وكان صغيرا فتربى عندها (الاصابة)

176 فكانت الحرة يوم الأربعاء لليلتين بقيتا في ذي الحجة، واستخلف مسلم على المدينة عمرو بن محمد الأشجعي، ويقال: حصين بن نمير السكوني، ويقال: روح بن زنباع الجذامي، ومات يزيد بن معاوية، فوثب أهل المدينة على من بها من أهل الشام، فأخرجوهم، وبويع ابن الزبير في رجب سنة أربع وستين، فولي أخاه عبيدة بن الزبير (اخبار القضاة)

against the Ummayyad dynasty. As Karbala had be blown out of proportion, so too was the case of Harrah.

If one were to merely read the basic historical texts of what occurred just prior to Harrah, one could easily ascertain that this was a war which could have easily been averted, had there been no shaitaani prodding from behind the scenes, continuously angering each party against the other.

Allâmah Ibn Kathir, whilst discussing the incident of Harrah, recorded the narration mentioned below, from which much can be learnt regarding the backdrop of events that finally led to the disastrous incident of Harrah. The crux of what he wrote was[177]:

---

[177] وكان سببها أن أهل المدينة لما خلعوا يزيد بن معاوية وولوا على قريش عبد الله بن مطيع وعلى الأنصار عبد الله بن حنظلة بن أبى عامر فلما كان فى أول هذه السنة أظهروا ذلك واجتمعوا عند المنبر فجعل الرجل منهم يقول قد خلعت يزيد كما خلعت عمامتى هذه ويلقيها عن رأسه ويقول الآخر قد خلعته كما خلعت نعلى هذه حتى اجتمع شىء كثير من العمائم والنعال هناك ثم اجتمعوا على إخراج عامل يزيد من بين أظهرهم وهو عثمان بن محمد بن أبى سفيان بن عم يزيد وعلى إجلاء بنى أمية من المدينة فاجتمعت بنو أمية فى دار مروان بن الحكم وأحاط بهم أهل المدينة يحاصرونهم واعتزل الناس على بن الحسين زين العابدين وكذلك عبد الله بن عمر ابن الخطاب لم يخلعا يزيد ولا أحد من بيت ابن عمر وكتب بنو أمية إلى يزيد بما هم فيه من الحصر والاهانة والجوع والعطش وإنه ان لم يبعث إليهم من ينقذهم مما هم فيه وإلا استؤصلوا عن آخرهم وبعثوا ذلك مع البريد فلما قدم بذلك على يزيد وجده جالسا على سريره ورجلاه في ماء يتبرد به مما به من النقرس في رجليه فلما قرأ الكتاب انزعج لذلك وقال وقال ويلك ما فيهم ألف رجل قال بلى قال فهل لا قاتلوا ساعة من نهار . ثم بعث إلى عمرو بن سعيد ابن العاص فقرأ عليه الكتاب واستشاره فيمن يبعثه إليهم وعرض عليه أن يبعثه إليهم فأبى عليه ذلك وقال إن أمير المؤمنين عزلنى عنها وهى مضبوطة وأمورها محكمة فأما الآن فإنما دماء قريش تراق بالصعيد فلا أحب أن أتولى ذلك منهم ليتول ذلك من هو أبعد منهم منى قال فبعث البريد إلى مسلم بن عقبة المزنى وهو شيخ كبير ضعيف فانتدب لذلك وأرسل معه يزيد عشرة آلاف فارس وقيل اثنا عشر ألفا وخمسة عشر ألف رجل وأعطى كل واحد منهم مائة دينار وقيل أربعة دنانير ثم استعرضهم وهو على فرس له
فقال النعمان بن بشير يا أمير المؤمنين ولنى عليهم أكفك وكان العمان أخا عبد الله بن حنظلة لأمه عمرة بنت رواحة فقال يزيد لا ليس لهم إلا هذا الغشمة والله لأقتلنهم بعد إحسانى إليهم وعفوى عنهم مرة بعد مرة فقال النعمان يا أمير المؤمنين أنشدك الله فى عشيرتك وأنصار رسول الله ص وقال عبد الله بن جعفر أرأيت ن رجعوا إلى طاعتك أيقبل منهم قال إن فعلوا فلا سبيل عليهم وقال يزيد لمسلم بن عقبة ادع القوم ثلاثا فان رجعوا إلى الطاعة فاقبل منهم وكف عنهم وإلا فاستعن بالله وقاتلهم وإذا ظهرت عليهم فأبح المدينة ثلاثا ثم أكفف عن الناس وانظر إلى على بن الحسين فاكفف عنه واستوص به خيرا وأدن مجلسه فانه لم يدخل فى شىء مما دخلوا فيه (البداية بتصرف يسير)

'The reason being this battle was that when the people of Madinah Munawwarah broke their allegiance from Yazîd ibn Muawiyah, they appointed Hadhrat Abdullâh ibn Mutee'ﷺ over the Qureish, and Hadhrat Abdullâh ibn Hanzalahﷺ over the Ansaar. They gathered at the pulpit and openly announced their breaking away from the Ummayyad leadership.

They then gathered to have the Ummayyad governor, Uthman ibn Muhammad as well as the rest of the Banu Ummayyah exiled from Madinah Munawwarah. Upon getting news of this, to ensure their protection, the Banu Ummayyah gathered in the dwelling of Marwan ibn Hakam, which the people of Madinah Munawwarah then surrounded. Hadhrat Zainul-Aabideen (the son of Hadhrat Huseinﷺ) and the household of Hadhrat Abdullâh ibn Umarﷺ however refused to break their allegiance to Yazîd.

The Banu Ummayyah wrote to Yazîd, describing their miserable plight, i.e. their being kept under siege, being disgraced, and being deprived of food and drink, and that if he does not immediately send an army over to rescue them from their plight, they could face total annihilation. When this letter reached Yazîd, it threw him in shock. Yazîd also expressed anger over the fact that despite the Banu Ummayyah in Madinah Munawwara comprising over a thousand, they had not stood up to fight, but instead allowed themselves to be placed under a siege.

Yazîd consulted with Amr ibn Saeed and requested that he lead the army, but Amr refused, saying that after having already been removed from his post as governor over Madinah Munawwara, he did not now desire that he be at the centre of Qureishi bloodshed. Amr ibn Saeed advised Yazîd to rather select such a person for the job who did not enjoy close family relations with the Qureish. The job was then presented to Muslim ibn Uqbah Muzani, who, despite being weak and old, accepted almost immediately.

(Not trusting Muslim ibn Uqbah,) Hadhrat Nu'maan ibn Bashir ﷺ *pleaded with Yazîd to allow him to lead the army, in the hope that his close family relationship with the new leader of the Ansaar, Hadhrat Abdullâh ibn Hanzala, would facilitate an easy reconciliation process. (Hadhrat Nu'maan* ﷺ *was the uterine brother of Hadhrat Abdullâh ibn Hanzalah* ﷺ*). Yazîd refused to accept his plea, and said, '**By Allâh! I have shown compassion and tolerance to them on so many occasions, yet their behaviour remains such. By Allâh! I shall now not accept for them except this 'destroyer'!***

Hadhrat Abdullâh ibn Ja'far ﷺ *then interceded, with the following question, **'If the people of Madinah Munawwara return to their pledge of obedience, will you accept it from them? Yazîd replied, 'If they do so, none shall harm them!'***

*Yazîd thus ordered Muslim ibn Uqbah to first invite the people of Madinah Munawwara, over a period of three days, to return to their pledge. He was only to attack if they refused to obey. Yazîd also ordered that if the army were able to enter into Madinah Munawwara, **they would be allowed only three days within the city to find and punish the ones behind the rebellion**. As for Ali ibn Husein (Zainul-Aabideen* ﷺ*) he was to be honoured and left alone, since he had not joined the rebellion.*

An accusation generally levelled against Yazîd is that he had ordered Muslim ibn Uqbah to plunder, raid and destroy Madinah Munawwara. This accusation is based upon a sentence attributed to him, said at the time of sending out the army, which was:

وإذا ظهرت عليهم فأبح المدينة ثلاثا ثم أكفف عن الناس

*'If you gain the upper hand (and are able to break through the opposition's defense), **you will have three days, during which Madinah shall be an 'open ground' for you**. After the passing of three days, order your men to withdraw from the people!*

What did Yazîd really mean when he said, ‘*you will have three days, during which Madinah shall be an ‘open ground’ for you!’*? Did he mean that during these three days his soldiers could do in Madinah Munawwarah whatever impermissible act they desired? Had this been his intention, it would have been a statement of kufr, which would surely have caused the Sahâbah and senior Tâbi’een around him to stand up and make an outcry. The statement, as the narration above shows clearly, was made in front of Hadhrat Nu’maan ibn Bashir and Hadhrat Abdullâh ibn Ja’far, yet the most that these two Sahâbah did was to intercede on behalf of the people of Madinah Munawwarah, and beg Yazîd to forgive them, due to their being from the family of the Ansaar. Had these Sahâbah understood Yazîd’s statement to mean ‘open permission to do as the soldiers pleased’, they would have themselves broken their allegiance and rallied the masses of Shaam against Yazîd.

Many a time, the meaning of a sentence is easily understood at the time that it is said, and by the audience to whom it is said, yet when that sentence leaves that environment and is now interpreted by merely looking towards its words, a different meaning emerges, totally contrary to what the speaker had intended, a meaning so filthy in nature, that had the speaker later come to know what was now being attributed to him, he would have great difficulty in even establishing which sentence of his had unintentionally indicated towards that meaning.

Many factors indicate that Yazîd’s above-mentioned statement falls into this very category, especially since he said this statement of his, not in privacy, but in front of noble, pious men, and none of them objected. Also, Yazîd’s very next sentence, i.e. ‘*after the passing of three days, order your men to withdraw from the people!*’, this sentence itself indicates that the order of Yazîd to his commander was not one asking for brutal force, mass killings, and total destruction, but rather that since the city of Madinah Munawwarah was one of great sanctity, in which before this no Muslim ruler had ever dared take in

his army, the army were thus required to be quick in moving through the city of Madinah Munawwarah whilst searching for the ones responsible for the rebellion. They had three days after entering the city to find and apprehend all responsible, in such a manner that after their exit from the city the rebellion does not rise again. Yazîd did not feel it appropriate that the sanctity of the noble city of Madinah Munawwarah be violated for more than three days, even if those responsible for the rebellion were still at large.

Perhaps this meaning may be hard for many to digest, but it is the only meaning that explains why the Sahâbah and Tâbi'een of Sham, who heard this statement directly, did not object. It also explains how the parties responsible for the first rebellion were able to so quickly re-organize their troops after the exit of the Ummayyad army, and retake the city of Madinah Munawwarah. It also explains why Hadhrat Abdullâh ibn Umar, his entire family, the family of Abdul Muttalib, Hadhrat Zainul-Aabideen and many others of Madinah Munawwarah, did not support those rebelling against the Ummayyads, neither before their entry into the city nor after. Had these great individuals seen those scenes which history would later paint regarding Harrah, they would surely have broken their allegiance and themselves lifted the flag against the Ummayyads.

Yes, there is no denying that certain atrocities did occur at the hands of certain soldiers, but there is a great possibility that these acts were in fact committed by hypocrites serving in the army, carried out in their private capacity, with the aim to defame the entire Muslim army and set the wheels in motion for a plan constructed years previously, i.e. to crumble the Muslim Caliphate and replace it with another, which would operate under shaitaani influence and direction.

In Karbala, as discussed earlier on, it was such evil men who had ensured that Hadhrat Husein never left the field alive, and it was such men who attacked the tents housing the noble women from the

family of Hadhrat Husein ﷺ. Yet, when it came to laying down accusations, sincere Muslim leaders were implicated, despite them having nothing to do with the atrocities committed. So too, in my humble opinion, is the case of Harrah, but only he shall believe who is ready to read between the lines and review this entire episode again. And it is Almighty Allâh alone who knows the complete truth, and He ﷻ alone shall expose it, when and how He ﷻ feels appropriate.

After the battle of Harrah, the army of Yazîd continued forward towards Makkah Mukarramah, where Hadhrat Abdullâh ibn Zubeir ؓ had risen the flag against them, but before the fighting could reach its peak, the news of the death of Yazîd spread, which brought a halt to the fight, and on his death our discussion regarding him shall also be closed.

As a closing statement I repeat, that in the writings above, the intention is not at all to prove the piety of Yazîd, since that is in the knowledge of Almighty Allâh alone. What I have merely shown is that the evidence that has been used to prove his guilt is not as solid as many have been made to believe. Islâmic law has never demanded that every individual's innocence be proven beyond doubt, since that is not within one's capacity. Yes, it is a demand of Islâmic teaching that each individual be given the benefit of the doubt, and that an accusation only be accepted when supported with solid evidence.

The purpose of the book is merely to highlight the possibility that Yazîd had been framed, in a shaitaani operation that had begun years previously, utilizing hundreds of hypocrites, spread all over the Muslim empire, with the aim of crushing the Muslim Caliphate, stopping the forward march of the Muslim armies into non-Muslim territories and tearing into pieces the unity that Hadhrat Muawiyah ؓ had just managed to restore. This plan would only prove successful if the hearts of the Ummah could turn against their leader, and Yazîd was the unfortunate target against whom this hatred was going to be sowed.

This booklet has now reached its end, in which many 'bloody' secrets regarding Karbala have been unearthed. As a conclusion, it would only be fair that the last few paragraphs be devoted to discussing one of the true culprits behind Karbala, one who, through cunning ways and the support he enjoyed from shaitaani circles, almost achieved his shaitaani aspiration of tumbling the caliphate, had it not been for Divine Interjection.

The mastermind behind Karbala Mukhtaar ibn Abu Ubeid Thaqafi, a dajjâl of this Ummah

At the beginning of this booklet, the discussion regarding this filthy, shaitaani agent, was initiated. As discussed already, Mukhtaar ibn Ubeid was the first host of Hadhrat Muslim ibn Aqeel, when he came over to Iraq to verify the contents of the letters that had been sent to Hadhrat Husein. The fact that Mukhtaar was the first host speaks volumes of the reality of the ones who had begged Hadhrat Husein to come over.

When Ubeidullah ibn Ziyaad arrived at Kufa, Mukhtaar was also arrested, but where the sincere friends of Hadhrat Husein were put to the sword, the lives of the hypocrites responsible in bringing Hadhrat Husein over to Iraq were ''amazingly spared'', as though Ubeidullah ibn Ziyaad was intentionally or unintentionally being controlled by orders coming from a higher shaitaani order. Mukhtaar ibn Ubeid would spend a mere few days in prison, due to which his fame would spread as being a true lover of Hadhrat Husein, whereas just a few years earlier he had attempted to have Hadhrat Husein arrested and handed over to Hadhrat Muawiyah. By spending just a few days in prison, all the previous enmity that Mukhtaar had shown to the household of Rasulullâh would now be forgotten and Mukhtaar

would take the title of ‘the true defender of the honour of the Ahle-Bait’.

Mukhtaar was the perfect candidate that shaitân could have chosen to cause chaos amongst the Muslim Ummah, since he enjoyed the privilege of being the brother-in-law of the great Sahâbi ؓ of that era, Hadhrat Abdullâh ibn Umar ؓ, a privilege which would surely earn him much recognition in Iraq. Upon the martyrdom of Hadhrat Husein ؓ, Mukhtaar would thereafter enhance his reputation by working upon the sentiments of people, and making the loudest call of ‘revenge for the Ahle-Bait’. From Iraq, Mukhtaar would have expensive gifts sent to the leading Sahâbah ؓ of Hijaaz, and in fact even presented himself in front of Hadhrat Abdullâh ibn Zubeir ؓ and pledged allegiance.

By the time the reality of Mukhtaar’s kufr beliefs became public knowledge, his army had already reached into the thousands, and the gullible souls of Iraq who now viewed Mukhtaar as the ‘savior of the Ummah’, they were in no way going to listen to the verdicts of the scholars around them, even after Mukhtaar proclaimed himself to be a ‘Nabi’.

Below shall follow a brief time-line of Mukhtaar ibn Ubeid, extracted from the reports written regarding him in the books of history, whereby the reader shall gain a great understanding of how shaitaani forces operate when it comes to promoting its agents in the eyes of the public and raising them to high seats, from which they are able to carry out major shaitaani operations, all in the guise of ‘Islâm’.

1) Mukhtaar ibn Ubeid is the first recorded host of Muslim Ibn Aqeel ؓ, despite being declared, just a few years ago, as a Khaariji (one who hates the Ahle-Bait). Muslim ibn Aqeel ؓ stays at the dwelling of Mukhtaar for only a few days, after which he ؓ himself decides to shift to another location.

2) Mukhtaar, together with many others, get arrested for their role in inviting Hadhrat Husein ﵁ over to Iraq, but Mukhtaar's life gets spared, whilst others, who had played a much less significant role, are executed.

3) After the battle of Karbala, upon being released, Mukhtaar travels to Hijaaz, pledges allegiance to Hadhrat Abdullâh ibn Zubeir ﵁, and soon takes the position of one of the senior generals under Abdullâh ibn Zubeir ﵁. Mukhtaar also fights under the flag of Hadhrat Abdullâh ibn Zubeir ﵁, during Yazîd's siege upon Makkah Mukarramah. When the news of Yazîd's death spreads, and the war comes to a temporary halt, Mukhtaar finds an excuse to break away from Hadhrat Abdullâh ibn Zubeir ﵁ and return to Iraq. Upon reaching Iraq, Mukhtaar starts inviting the masses towards Muhammad ibn Hanafiyah, the son of Hadhrat Ali ﵁, with the claim that he, Muhammad, is the 'promised Mahdi', and that Mukhtaar is his representative in Iraq. When Muhammad ibn Hanafiyah receives news of this, he openly declares its falsehood, but Mukhtaar's beguiled followers remain deaf to his words, in the belief that Muhammad ibn Hanafiyah is merely practicing 'Taqiyyah' (concealing the truth from the Ummayyad leaders that surround him in Hijaaz).

4) Mukhtaar raises the call for 'revenge for the Ahle-Bait', a call that finds tremendous support from all circles, until finally Mukhtaar removes Abdullâh ibn Mutee, the governor of Hadhrat Abdullâh ibn Zubeir ﵁, and takes control over Iraq.

5) Mukhtaar's movement in Iraq gains momentum as he goes in search of all that had taken part in the battle of Karbala. Umar ibn Sa'd and other Ummayyad generals are hunted down and Mukhtaar's fame as 'defender of the Ahle-Bait' spreads. His

armies continue taking area upon area, and now pose a major threat to the Ummayyad Caliphate, which forces the new Ummayyad leader, Abdul Malik ibn Marwan, to gather his forces and bring them face to face with that of Mukhtaar's. Mukhtaar's forces deliver a severe blow to the Ummayyad army, and their fame grows even more.

6) Being aided with shaitaani forces, Mukhtaar beguiles thousands and amasses an army that ravages Iraq, killing not only those involved at Karbala, but rather every group linked to the Ummayyad government. So sure is Mukhtaar of victory that before each battle he announces that Almighty Allâh had informed him of victory for his army. This lie of his attracts many more followers, but lands him in trouble when his army suffers their first defeat.

   Certain followers demanded to know how could they be defeated after having received Divine assurance of victory. In response, Mukhtaar produces perhaps one of the filthiest lies ever said with regards to the Being of Almighty Allâh, i.e. that Almighty Allâh had forgotten! Nauuzubillah! Despite his answer being so filthy and absurd, his shaitaani agents ensure that the masses accept even this, and this belief, known as 'Ba daa' is made a fundamental belief of the shia creed.

7) Mukhtaar's words of kufr breaks all barriers, with him now declaring himself first as the representative of the Awaited Mahdi, then as the Mahdi himself, then as a Nabi' and finally as 'The Almighty incarnated'. Nauuzubillah!

   Amongst the filth that Mukhtaar propagates is the claim that he has in his possession a chair, which is from the hidden treasures of Hadhrat Ali؄, a chair which holds the position in this Ummah

like that which the Taaboth (the Ark of the Covenant) enjoyed during the era of the Banu Israel. Mukhtaar would order that this chair be placed at the front of his army, and would proclaim that victory was assured on account of the blessings of that chair. Nauuzubillah!

8) The Sahâbah of Madinah Munawwarah, with Hadhrat Abdullâh ibn Umar, Hadhrat Abdullâh ibn Abbaas and Hadhrat Abdullâh ibn Zubeir in the forefront, openly declare the kufr of Mukhtaar, but that too cannot pull the masses away from him. Mukhtaar takes control over all the major Muslim lands, except Shaam, Egypt and Hijaaz.

9) When on the verge of taking over the entire Muslim world, Almighty Allâh sets up a barrier in Mukhtaar's path and slowly but surely his shaitaani dream starts collapsing. The crux of Mukhtaar's' collapse is as follows:

- First, the Arabs in Iraq, who had accepted him as their savior, start noticing that Mukhtaar is favouring the 'Ajam' Iraqis (non-Arabs from Iraq/Iran) over them, and instigating them to kill and usurp the wealth of the Arabs, wherever and whenever they find the opportunity.

- Ibrahim ibn Ashtar, the senior general of Mukhtaar's' army, who had been beguiled into entering into his service, now starts receiving numerous complaints regarding Mukhtaar, and authentic reports that Mukhtaar is making claims of being a Nabi. After much thought, and with great difficulty, Ibrahim ibn Ashtar finally pulls away his support for Mukhtaar, and encourages his loyal followers to do the same.

- Mus'ab ibn Zubeir, the brother of Abdullâh ibn Zubeir, after finding the Arabs of Iraq begging for protection from Mukhtaar's

now-exposed evil and filthy intentions, calls for reinforcements from all loyal followers of his brother, Hadhrat Abdullâh ibn Zubeir.

- Almighty Allâh finally destroys Mukhtaar and his mighty army at the hands of Mus'ab ibn Zubeir, after a reign of terror which had taken the lives of thousands and had robbed many of their Imaan. So strong was Mukhtaar's web of deception that even his wife, despite being the daughter of a Sahâbi, was duped into believing him to be a Nabi. Mus'ab ibn Zubeir, makes great effort to correct her belief, but finally finds no alternative but to have her executed, on account of her apostasy.

- With the death of Mukhtaar, much of his secrets, cunning plots, satanic statements, etc, gets exposed, which convince all around that the warning issued by Rasulullâh regarding the emergence of a 'dajjâl' from the tribe of Thaqeef, that dajjâl was none other but this very Mukhtaar.

In shaitaani, dajjâli circles, hundreds of thousands of agents are employed, each with a different role, and unaware of many of the other agents that work around him, with each enjoying a different level of superiority and closeness to their master, who is none other than Iblîs himself, with dajjâl at the head of all operations. In every era, certain shaitaani agents stand out amongst the rest, whose influence, teachings, acts of oppression, deception, etc, is felt the most. During the era that followed the death of Hadhrat Umar, it was this Mukhtaar ibn Ubeid that was one of shaitân's and dajjâl's most selected agents, chosen for the task of collapsing the Muslim Caliphate, and spreading chaos amongst the masses.

As with all high-ranking satanists, in order to ease his satanic task, the shaitaani world, with all its human and jinn resources, placed itself at the service of Mukhtaar, thus providing him with:

- never-ending treasures of wealth, through which he purchased the loyalty of the non-Arabs of Iraq, Iran and surrounding areas

- the ability to beguile the ignorant by displaying to them signs which indicated that Almighty Allâh’s help was with him. According to what has been reported, Mukhtaar gathered around him the fighters of numerous villages by pointing to the sky and displaying to them his heavenly soldiers, i.e. huge men on horses, flying above his head, which were nothing but jinn, in the guise of angels.

- the ability to predict forthcoming events, by utilizing the information the jinn would relate to him, after stealing news from the talks of the angels of the lowest heaven

- the ability to deceive through the art of forgery, an art which was taught to him by his shaitaani masters

Mukhtaar, in the love of the power the shayâtîn had offered him, sacrificed his soul to the devil, and carved out his place in the pits of Hell. In attempting to reach his goal of reproducing in this Ummah what Paul, the hypocrite, had done to the teachings of Nabi Isaعليه السلام, Mukhtaar ibn Ubeid, with direction from his satan masters, conjured many plots and conspiracies, which took the lives of thousands, and robbed just as many of their faith, but the plot that stood out the most, and had the furthest reaching consequences was the plot that the world would later call ‘Karbala’!

It was through this satanic plot that Mukhtaar would draw Hadhrat Husseinرضي الله عنه over to Iraq; have him mercilessly slaughtered; have the leaders of the Ummayyad caliphate in Shâm framed for this demonic act; and thereafter draw the entire Muslim world back into the chaos, turmoil and in-fighting which they had just recently come out of.

Where the world continues cursing Yazîd for his evil act of murdering the grandson of Rasulullâhﷺ, an act which Yazîd till the end declared himself innocent of, it is indeed unfortunate that this shaitaani agent, Mukhtaar ibn Ubeid Thaqafi, has managed to evade the public eye, due to the blanket thrown over his satanic deeds by the shaitaani agents that followed after him.

Had the eye of the Ummah been on Mukhtaar ibn Ubeid, the Ummah would perhaps have been saved from much of the confusion and bloodshed that had occurred, as he pulled strings from behind the curtains, during his lifetime, and as other shaitaani agents pulled strings after his death, which finally resulted in the first collapse of an Islâmic Caliphate, about seventy years later, surrounded by scenes of mass execution, torture, and the opening of all doors of fitnah (religious confusion, evil and turmoil) by the new Abbaasi Caliphate, which was in fact a shaitaani-backed government that had originated in Iran (Khurâsân), with nineteen of its twenty 'founding fathers' being non-Arabs from Iraq/Iran itself.

An in-depth study of the rise of this new caliphate (The Abbasid Caliphate) shall reveal a massive shaitaani conspiracy which laid its foundation the day Hadhrat Huseinرضي الله عنه was martyred, a movement that continued its work underground during the era that followed the defeat of Mukhtaar ibn Ubeid, (i.e. the era of Abdul Malik ibn Marwân, Hadhrat Umar ibn Abdul Aziz, etc), and finally succeeded about seventy years later in crushing the Ummayyad Caliphate, by utilizing the name of Hadhrat Abbaasرضي الله عنه and the slogan of 'love for the Ahle-Bait' as a magnet to attract the support of the masses and to conceal their filthy identity. By naming the new caliph as "Abbasid'' shaitaani elements were able to ensure that none from the family of Hadhrat Fatimahرضي الله عنها could demand to be its leader.

Under the new Abbasid Caliphate, satanic and irreligious groups found the opportunity to spread freely their evil ideologies, without any fear of being reprimanded, arrested or executed. Enjoying this freedom, the Qadariyâh, Mu'tazila, Khawârij and shia were now able to create

hundreds of zindeeq groups and ideologies which very quickly attained prominence throughout the Muslim world, amongst which were:

- The issue of Khalqul-Quraan (a satanist effort to deceive the masses into understanding that the Noble Quraan was created), which threw the Muslim world into confusion, until Almighty Allâh made scholars like Imam Ahmed ibn Hanbal and others stand up

- the translating of ancient philosophical writings into Arabic which corrupted the belief of thousands and could have resulted in wide-spread Irtidaad (apostasy) had Almighty Allâh not created scholars like Imaam Ghazali and others

- the fabricating of thousands of Ahâdith and spreading it amongst the masses, which could have destroyed the treasure-house of Sunnah, had Almighty Allâh not created scholars like Sufyaan ibn Uyainah and others

Due to the concealed support evil forces operating from Iran/Iraq received from this caliphate, they were able to establish the first shia empire in Egypt, (The Faatimid Empire), which would for years thereafter act as the hidden dagger of the kuffaar, stabbing the Muslim Ummah from behind and rendering them helpless from advancing further in their Islâmic conquests. These very Faatimids would later open the road for the massive invasion of the Tartars upon the entire Muslim world, an invasion that would have indeed uprooted Islâm, had it not been for Divine Intervention.

Thus, when Sultân Salahuddin Ayoubi rose to power, his first concern was to break the threat posed by the Faatimid Empire, knowing well that as long as this evil empire remains standing, Muslim efforts to ward off and attack kuffaar powers would always prove futile. Instead of advancing with his forces towards Masjid-al-Aqsa, he directed his effort towards Egypt, where he succeeded in crushing the Faatimid Empire and ridding the Ummah of the hidden dagger that had caused

havoc amongst the Muslims for so long. With this shaitaani group dismantled, Muslims were able to make great advancements, and succeeded in taking back Masjid-al-Aqsa, as well as finally conquering Constantinople (Istanbul), the fort of the Christian Empire, which had succeeded in holding out against Muslim invasion for over four hundred years.

This in brief is the history that followed after the fateful battle at ‘Karbala’, a battle drenched in ‘bloody’ lies, and one that till today remains as a tool to attract public sympathy and support, playing a role similar to that of the ‘Holocaust’ and ‘911’.

Conclusion

1. If one were to act as a lawyer to show that the evidence against ‘one accused of murder’ is not solid, this in no way implies that he hates the one ‘murdered’. Nay, rather his purpose is merely to expose the fact that since there is a lot of conflicting evidence in the issue, it would indeed be appropriate to consider the possibility of another ‘suspect’ being involved, and the ‘accused’ having been framed.

Similar is the case of ‘Karbala’. The purpose of the writings of this book is merely to reopen the files of this case, and to consider the possibility of an international conspiracy, towards which many facts and events indeed do indicate.

2. In the writings above, one point that has been proven quite strongly is that Hadhrat Husein﵁’s journey to Iraq had nothing to do with the character of Yazîd, whether he was evil or not, but rather with the issue of who should be caliph. After understanding this, one should ask the question as to why now are we adamant to delve into the personal, private life of Yazîd, and prove that he indeed was a drunkard, adulterer, etc. Have we not been taught to hold good opinion of fellow believers, and to avoid prying into their private affairs?

3. Whosoever attempts to question any issue regarding 'Karbala' immediately gets labeled as harboring hatred for the 'Ahle-e-Bait', whereas as mentioned in point 'one' when a lawyer stands to question the strength of the proof against the 'accused', it in no way implies that he is harboring hatred against the 'murdered party'. Labeling anyone questioning the facts regarding 'Karbala' as 'enemies of the Ahle-Bait' is similar to the practice of labeling those who question the truth behind the 'holocaust' and '911' as 'Anti-Semitic' and as a 'terrorist'.

Just as how the love for Rasulullâhﷺ is an integral part and an obvious demand of Imaan, so too is the love of those that were beloved to Rasulullâhﷺ, with the pure daughters of Rasulullâhﷺ, hisﷺ pure grandchildren, hisﷺ pure wives, hisﷺ believing pure uncles and aunts, (collectively known as the Ahle-Bait) and those Sahâbah رضي الله عنهم who accepted Islâm right at the beginning, being in the forefront of those who Rasulullâhﷺ loved the most. Any doubt harbored against any of these illustrious personalities places one's Imaan on the brink of ruin. May Almighty Allâh save us all from saying, writing or making any type of indication which displeases Almighty Allâh and causes hurt to Rasulullâhﷺ.

May Almighty Allâh forgive this servant, let the Ummah rectify the many errors that definitely exist in this compilation, and allow the truth to manifest itself in this world already. He جل جلاله alone is The Ultimate Truth, He جل جلاله alone knows the entire truth, and He جل جلاله alone exposes the truth wherever and whenever He جل جلاله wishes.

I request the readers of this compilation to please inform the writer of errors, misunderstandings and incorrect quotations that have resulted, due to the incompetence of this weak servant; to make dua for my

salvation and if one agrees with what has been written, to assist in its propagation. Jazakumullah Khairan.[178]

[178] Completed, by the Grace of Almighty Allah, on the 7th Zhul-Hijjah 1434
Feedback may be sent via email to abumuhammad8008@gmail.com